DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 581 SP 018 622

AUTHOR	Howey, Kenneth R., Ed.; Bents, Richard H., Ed.
TITLE	Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher. Initial Training/Induction/Inservice.
INSTITUTION	Midwest Teacher Corps Network, Lansing, Mich.; Minnesota Univ., St. Paul.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE	79
GRANT	G007700055
NOTE	158p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; College School Cooperation; Educational Innovation; *Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Morale; *Teacher Orientation; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

Nine discussions identify needs and concerns of beginning teachers and call for a more concerted effort to ensure a smooth transition from preservice teacher to a working professional. An historical perspective on beginning teachers' problems and attempted solutions is provided in the first chapter. An interview with four beginning teachers follows, with illustrations of the types of problems encountered in such areas as discipline, time management, and lack of feedback. Other essays suggest new entrance modes for teacher orientation, a stronger relationship between theory and practice in schools of education, and increased research on the initial teaching experience. Two chapters offer models from the perspectives of the school principal and the college dean, one for the encouragement of school-college cooperation, and the other proposing a concept of teacher education based on schools as centers of inquiry. The final essay presents a general framework for induction and continuing teacher education, incorporating several of the elements that were introduced in the earlier chapters. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206581

Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher

Initial Training / Induction / Inservice

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth R. Howey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Editors

Kenneth R. Howey Richard H. Bents

SP018622

Toward Meeting the Needs of The Beginning Teacher

Edited by
Kenneth R. Howey Richard H. Bents

A publication of the Midwest Teacher Corps Network and University of Minnesota/St. Paul Schools Teacher Corps Project under a grant from Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This project was performed pursuant to Grant No. G007700055 from Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The point of view expressed herein are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Minneapolis, Minnesota
1979

Acknowledgements

This publication resulted from the cooperative efforts of many individuals. The contributors all deserve special thanks for sharing their ideas. The beginning teachers who consented to be interviewed are also to be noted. However, a special commendation is reserved for Sandra Bannister whose valiant work in the preparation of the manuscript provided the necessary organization to bring this work to fruition.

Contributors

Richard Bents	Research Associate, College of Education University of Minnesota
William Gardner	Dean, College of Education University of Minnesota
Sally Glassberg	Assistant Professor, Hobart and William Smith Colleges. Dr. Glassberg has recently accepted an appointment at the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University
Kenneth Howey	Professor, College of Education University of Minnesota
Carol Lewis	Education Policy Fellow, Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University
H. Vaughn Phelps	Superintendent of Schools, The Westside Community Schools, Omaha, Nebraska
Kevin Ryan	Professor, Educational Foundations and Research, The Ohio State University
Joseph Vaughan	Educational Research Specialist, Teaching and Instruction Program, National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Foreword

Teacher Corps has always had a vested interest in the beginning teacher. From its inception, the Teacher Corps internship program provided a model for the induction of teachers into professional settings where beginning teaching was considered to be extremely difficult. Additionally, the internship program provided a valuable link, if taken advantage of, between teacher training and inservice teacher education. While much has been learned from Teacher Corps involvement with the beginning teacher, critical issues still remain to be addressed.

In the early days of Teacher Corps major efforts were launched to provide teachers, specifically trained, to work in areas where the larger majority of the client-population was considered to have characteristics indicative of low socioeconomic status. Recently, the thrust has been to supplement the educational experiences of existing staffs who work with children from low income areas while gradually decreasing the emphasis one places on the training of new teachers. Given the present conditions of teacher supply and demand, the focus on inservice, collaborative working relationships among colleges of education, public schools and state departments of education, together with what has been learned regarding the beginning teacher; one could argue that the time is ripe to focus on the needs of the beginning teacher.

This publication, a joint effort between the Midwest Teacher Corps Network and the University of Minnesota/St. Paul Public Schools Teacher Corps Project, attempts to address the concerns raised in the previous paragraph. This publication attempts to identify needs and issues concerning the beginning teacher. Past efforts and lessons learned are reviewed, conceptual, theoretical and operational models to facilitate induction into the teaching profession are offered, and finally throughout this publication, challenges are presented and questions for further study are raised.

The intent here is to provide a background for continuing efforts regarding the early years of teaching. Hopefully this publication will serve as a catalyst for discussion and action in meeting the needs of the beginning teacher.

John Brown
Midwest Teacher Corps Network
Executive Secretary

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements iii

Contributors v

Foreword
John Brown vii

Introduction
Richard Bents and Kenneth Howey 1

A Historical Perspective
Richard Bents and Kenneth Howey 7

A Talk with Beginning Teachers
Kenneth Howey and Richard Bents 19

Toward Understanding the Problem: At the Threshhold of the Profession
Kevin Ryan 35

Some Essential Characteristics of Programs to Support Teachers in the Beginning Years
Carol Lewis 53

The Interaction of Context With Teachers, Teachers and Teacher Education: An Emphasis on the Beginning Years
Joseph Vaughan 67

A Superintendent's Perspective of Support for Teachers in the Beginning Years
H. Vaughn Phelps 85

A Dean's Perspective of Support for Teachers in the Beginning Years
William Gardner 95

A Developmental Model for the Beginning Teacher
Sally Glassberg 111

A General Framework for Induction and Continuing Teacher Education
Kenneth Howey and Richard Bents 139

INTRODUCTION

Richard Bents
and
Kenneth Howey

The current fragmented status of teacher education in America demands that the initial professional preparation and continuing education of teachers be viewed more as a developmental progression. The period of induction into the profession, when one first assumes a teaching assignment, is a critical period in a developmental conception of teacher education. The professional teacher must possess both general knowledge and specific knowledge; that which is requisite to success in a specific setting. Without general knowledge one becomes a mere technician. Without special knowledge one cannot adapt appropriately or accommodate well another individual over time. These basic notions permeate all aspects of teacher education. Yet little attention is given to the needs of the beginning teachers as they attempt to balance the adaptation of general knowledge with the acquisition of needed special knowledge in the first year(s) of teaching. The following chapters more fully identify needs and concerns of the beginning teachers, provide some possible means to confront these problems, and hopefully issue a general challenge for a more concerted effort to provide a clearly articulated teacher education progression and in particular a smooth induction into the teaching profession.

In Chapter II the editors provide an historical review of some of the more common efforts over the years to assist beginning teachers. They note that although internship schemes have been evident for a long time, rarely have they been developed based upon some analysis of specific needs or concerns of the beginning teacher. It has also been rare when these internships are built in a developmental way on preservice experiences. Rather, a review of various types of internships from 1900 to the present led the editors to conclude that historically these experiences were generally limited forms of apprenticeships shaped primarily by varying political and economic conditions. Thus, forms of internships or, better, apprenticeships have existed for many years and it is now time to move to schemes which better integrate theory and practice in the induction phase. The chapter concludes with illustrations from exemplary programs which have addressed this latter concern.

Chapter III graphically illustrates the types of problems which beginning teachers say they encounter. The interview with beginning teachers underscores such common concerns as the lack of feedback about their teaching, how to gain acceptance by students and faculty, understanding how the "system" works, and acquiring a personal confidant. These teachers also identify student discipline, finding enough time to locate materials and resources, and assuming total responsibility, as problems encountered during the first years of teaching. Although there are obvious differences among beginning teachers and the problems they

encounter, the concerns enumerated here generally coincide with the research on beginning teachers which others have engaged in—some of which are reviewed in later chapters.

When asked what kinds of arrangements would make the initial year(s) of teaching more comfortable and productive, the beginning teachers suggested that arrangements which paired them with experienced teachers would be helpful. They also wished to be released periodically from instructional responsibilities for study, reflection and planning. Opportunities to observe other teachers and a better orientation to resources and people within the district were also suggested as beneficial by the beginning teachers. They emphasized that more inservice should be based upon discussions of what they believe to be problems and concerns.

Kevin Ryan in Chapter IV sheds further light on the problems of the beginning teacher. He states that beginning teachers have difficulty because initial training is limited in a number of ways, especially in terms of diverse teaching models. He also addresses the problem of relatively low selection standards. He makes the point, "Since those selecting people into training and those doing the actual training for teaching do not have clear and defensible criteria of what constitutes the good teacher, few people are screened out." Said another way, large numbers of people with diverse attitudes and widely varying characteristics enter the schools not having been tested for the demands and challenges of the profession in any rigorous fashion. He also notes that initial teacher preparation does not prepare teachers adequately for a variety of possible teaching assignments. He reviews Dolls' recent research which illustrates the considerable range of different elementary schools alone. These differences are not generally reflected in preservice programs.

Ryan reviews long-term effects of the formative teaching years. Research on beginning teachers has demonstrated in several instances that teacher attitudes have become more negative and behaviors more inflexible during the initial teaching period. One explanation is that the beginning teacher, when he discovers "something that works" in an effort to survive, has a tendency to stick with that practice for a prolonged period of time. This rather random "find something that works" approach precludes longer range developmental perspectives from emerging.

Ryan posits that in order to work toward more effective education and support for beginning teachers, conceptual changes must occur. The problem is resolvable provided new entrance modes for the beginning teacher are established, new interpretive tools (for understanding schools) are developed, and the new teacher is not expected to do everything immediately. He also suggests that more instructional activities in preservice center upon acquainting the new teacher with problems of the beginning years and a better orientation to the new system be provided upon employment. Ideally, the college of education and public

schools would work together to provide support and inservice for the new teacher. The inservice is a continued orientation as well as being designed to specifically address the unique concerns of the neophyte. He notes that additional human support is needed. He suggests setting up a buddy system where the new teacher works as a part of a team, and where special counseling is provided for the beginning teacher.

Carol Lewis in Chapter V underscores that currently there is no comprehensive set of guidelines which might be of benefit to various policy makers who have the potential to make needed changes in teacher education, and particularly induction into the teaching profession. A problem she notes is that, unlike apprenticeships in other crafts and professions, there is no formalized system for experienced teachers to record much of what they have learned and pass it on to the beginning teacher. Therefore she calls for a stronger relationship between theory and methods work in both the preservice and induction phases.

Several issues associated with internship programs are reviewed in this chapter. Thus, she concludes that while the concept has received a lot of attention it is not surprising that there has been little statewide implementation. She suggests that improved induction programs might be facilitated through state and federally funded teacher centers, and she reviews progress being made in several states.

Lewis also reinforces the need for cooperation not only between public school personnel and the faculty of the colleges of education, but between state legislatures, boards of education, state education agencies and program approval and certification offices as well. In her words, "We need to set aside the time to explore together the purposes and processes of school experiences, and better define the teacher's role in the school. That kind of cooperation and collaboration takes time, and a commitment to rethinking and redesigning resources to focus the learning of the new teacher in ways that are meaningful. Clarification of the various roles to be played by various parties is an essential part of that dialogue."

To implement such a collaborative notion, Lewis supports the "islands of change" approach which would identify selected sites for testing new models. This position is similar to that taken by Gardner in Chapter VIII, who suggests that Robert Schaeffer's notion of schools of inquiry would be an ideal type of environment for inducting new teachers into the profession.

In Chapter VI Joseph Vaughan stresses the need for research on the beginning years of teaching. Teacher-effects research, he states, has proved a helpful source regarding the content of teacher education, but it does not address the nature and implications of the context of teacher education. Vaughan, defines context "as the interaction of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors of educational personnel, students and others with factors and conditions such as type of training activities, physical setting, role-expectations, socialization processes and stages of adult development."

Vaughan suggests that in order to add to our knowledge about

teacher education, research efforts should focus on a) teachers who are effective and b) intervention processes used in developing teachers. He reviews the work of Doyle and Fenstermacher as examples of research concerned with the context of teacher education which is particularly relevant to the beginning years of teaching. He also notes the potential of applying knowledge of adult growth and development to the education of teachers. Glassberg in a later chapter elaborates more fully on this possibility.

In conclusion, Vaughan, as Ryan, calls for both conceptual clarity and descriptive research, especially on the articulation between various phases of teacher education. He reminds us that: a) Undergirding criteria need to be set to answer "what is an effective teacher," and that b) a variety of complementary research methodologies will be needed to meet this goal. It is also imperative that research focus not only on academic concerns but on the resolution of political issues as well.

Chapter VII outlines an operational model which provides support for new teachers. H. Vaughn Phelps provides us with the perspective of an experienced and respected school administrator. He argues that a set of conditions exist today which should allow those within teacher education to invest more time and energies to the induction of teachers. He cites a cooperative program between the University of Nebraska at Omaha and the Westside Community Schools in that city as an example of that type of investment. The most salient characteristics of the program include: rigorous selection of candidates in preservice, diverse and earlier experiences with children throughout that phase of teacher preparation, articulated and developmental sequences of experiences through induction, and opportunity for the beginning teacher to be an active participant and decision-maker on educational teams throughout initial phases of preparation. He calls for a joint commitment by the schools and college of education to prepare teachers in preservice and a similar joint commitment to a well-delineated induction phase. He reminds us that a teacher simply cannot be wholly educated in four academic years and stresses the need for schemes which better allow continuing education on the job.

William Gardner, in Chapter VIII, provides a dean's perspective of how teachers might be inducted into schools. He reminds us of Schaeffer's challenging question: "Why should our schools not be staffed, gradually if you will, by scholar-teachers in command of the conceptual tools and methods of inquiry requisite to investigating the learning process as it operates in their own classrooms?" Gardner cautions against simplistic apprenticeship modes of training and induction at the expense of professional programs which are needed to ensure such scholar-teachers. He calls for all parties with vested interest in teacher education to assist in determining the curriculum of the professional schools.

Gardner identifies three basic problem areas. First, he is concerned about the amount of time and type of initial preparation. Teacher education curriculum is overcrowded and incoherent. "We do not have

a grip yet on the corpus of knowledge that undergirds teaching, the essential "knowing and doing" aspects that characterize a profession." Second, there is not enough emphasis on theory and too much "hands on" activity. This is not to say that practice is not important, but rather that the teacher should be directed toward a lifetime of inquiry and analysis together with its practical application. The emphasis should be on the "profession" rather than the "technical." Third, the selection and socialization of teachers tend to foster a conservative outlook and resistance by teachers to change. Gardner suggests that selection criteria are minimal or non-selective and tend to attract many people who only have a limited interest in teaching. This together with the lack of analytical skills act as a deterrent to the continuing education of these teachers. He concludes his chapter by offering "an immodest proposal" which addresses several of these problems.

Sally Glassberg, in Chapter IX, provides a model for the induction into the teaching profession based upon developmental theory. A review of developmental theory and its relationship to teaching effectiveness is outlined. Glassberg underscores the need to understand the problem of the beginning teacher from multiple perspectives. She illustrates this by reviewing sociological concerns as identified by Dan Lortie, psychological concerns as articulated by Frances Fuller, and moral/philosophical concerns as suggested by Maxine Green. These perspectives emphasize the complexity of trying to better accommodate the beginning teacher and the need for more comprehensive and coherent planning in order to do so.

By way of illustration Glassberg presents a developmental model which uses theory in practice. The model calls for forms of structured psychological support for the new teachers. It also emphasizes role-taking, disequilibrium, action/reflection, and peer supervision in a collegial atmosphere. The model puts the teachers themselves at the core of the growth and developmental process. They must assume major initiative in assessing needs, planning, and implementing needed strategies.

In Chapter X, the editors provide a general framework for induction and continuing teacher education. They posit that different strategies are needed to ensure 1) the psychological well-being and continuing development of the teacher as a person, 2) that the school functions as a dynamic organization, and 3) the need for continuing growth as a teacher. Their basic assumption is that these three goals are intimately entwined. Howey and Bents build upon Glassberg's concern for adult growth and development, incorporate the notions of Gardner and Vaughan with respect to the contextual or organizational aspects of schooling, and draw on teaching effectiveness research to enhance basic pedagogical development.

They illustrate how their framework provides a means of thinking through the various decisions faced in planning a coherent and interrelated program of induction or inservice. They discuss assessment, instructional formats, incentives, documentation/evaluation, gover-

nance, and management as basic facets of teacher education in the context of the three interrelated goals. They provide multiple examples of how adult cognitive development and environmental (school) conditions can either enhance or constrain the continuing education of the beginning teacher. The basic notion is that different elements of continuing teacher education would be approached differently relative to the distinct purposes of the program and the personal/professional maturity of the teacher.

The editors conclude by calling upon the various individuals, agencies, and organizations which have a vested interest in teacher education, especially beginning teacher education, to join hands in order that the problems of the beginning teacher might be approached in both creative and conceptually coherent ways.

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Richard Bents
and
Kenneth Howey

The relationships or potential relationships between preservice and inservice teacher education have commonly been neglected. Rarely, for example, have formal programs of inservice, especially for the beginning teacher (induction), been built upon or designed around the learning experiences that the new teacher either engaged in or did not engage in during his or her preservice training. Rarely have experienced school practitioners whether teachers, counselors, or administrators been directly involved in the design and development of preservice programs. Joint curriculum development and even joint instruction between professor and teacher for the preservice teacher is virtually non-existent.

The data from both the Preservice and Inservice Studies recently conducted by Howey, Yarger and Joyce (1978) underscore the lack of follow-up for graduating teachers in the first year or two of teaching not only by those in higher education but by those in the schools as well. Beneath the considerable rhetoric about "collaboration," one can find little evidence today of joint effort in programming experiences for the beginning teacher either in preservice or the first years of teaching. "Student-teaching" might be identified by some as an exception when it comes to collaborative programming. A critical analysis in most situations, however, reveals modest joint-planning and often minimal articulation between campus experiences and classroom practice. In fact basic incompatabilities are not uncommon. In many situations it appears more a matter of token reciprocity, that is a modest honoria and some assistance for the "cooperating" teacher in return for a place for the novitiate to practice (within definite limits) and the promise of some general supervision.

Collaboration or various forms of cooperation are hardly an end in themselves. The primary purpose of this often difficult working relationship would be in this situation to enhance the educational programming for the beginning teacher both prior to and immediately after graduation. The need for continuing forms of cooperation might not be as great if in fact, 1) appropriate preservice activities were designed in an *interrelated* and *developmental* fashion, and 2) initial teaching assignments further reenforced many of these learning activities and allowed for additional learnings that were especially consonant with the classroom context and were related to earlier programming. This is simply not the situation.

These writers are aware of no effort to systematically examine just which teacher education content and processes are most appropriately

included in initial preparation, let alone any rational reflection about which content and which processes best take place at what time (that is in light of what other experiences) and in what context (college classrooms, teaching laboratories, schools). One only need to review in a cursory fashion the topics in some of the first courses offered the student of teaching to realize that content would be much better reserved for the first year or two of teaching. On the other hand one cringes at the content of some inservice offerings, because it is information which should have been essential content in any initial program of preparation and for some it is first being advanced. While it should go without saying that there is no way that what we presently construe as "preservice" training can or should be expected "to produce rather final products." That naive notion appears to enjoy some popularity. The lament that "we have to pick up the pieces" in terms of the beginning teacher carries with it some peculiar assumptions: first, that there is minimal need for additional (formal) learning at this critical juncture, second, that this novitiate is warmly and readily accepted into a new setting, and third, that the transition to accommodating the needs of 25 to 30 youngsters simultaneously is a relatively easy task for someone who has had all or portions of several weeks experience to get ready to assume such an (unrealistic?) responsibility.

There is no argument that this induction period is both a critical and potentially fertile area in the educational development of a teacher. As you will see throughout this book there is ample documentation that several needs of the beginning teacher are not adequately addressed. In the Inservice Study noted earlier, the investigators found that less than one in five teachers indicated that they received adequate assistance when they first began teaching. A startling ratio of 1 in 10 indicated that they had received *no* inservice help whatsoever when they first began teaching. The primary assistance which was offered came not from those prepared as teacher educators but rather from colleagues. This situation was corroborated by the higher education respondents who indicated they rarely, if ever, provided any inservice assistance that was based upon student follow-up from preservice. They saw little articulation of any kind between pre and inservice teacher education.

While structured experiences, then, for the beginning teacher are not common today, historically, there have been some attempts to provide school-focused training for the beginning teacher. These training and support efforts have commonly employed the term internship to identify their efforts.

The concept of internships is hardly a new idea; the precedents for systematically planned, supervised, semiautonomous, on-the-job training in many vocations can be traced to antiquity. However, internship is a twentieth-century term, and this review will consider only developments in teacher education in the 1900's. The activities of the beginning teacher, which included further study usually offered by an institution of higher education, some systematic supervision, and actual teaching experience which extended beyond student teaching requirements but

was still prior to initial teaching certification or licensure, was commonly referred to as an internship. More recently, additional job-embedded training extending from one to three years beyond the internship and still prior to initial certification or licensure has been referred to as a residency. A rather detailed definition of internships in teacher education was adopted in 1967 by the Association for Student Teaching, Commission on Internships in Teacher Education:

> The internship in teacher education is an integral part of the professional preparation of the teacher candidate, having been preceded by successful observation - participation and student teaching or equivalent clinical experiences in a school environment, and is planned and coordinated by the teacher education institution in cooperation with one or more school systems. The intern is contracted by and paid by a local school board, assigned a carefully planned teaching load for a school year, and enrolled in college courses that parallel his professional experience. The intern is supervised both by a highly competent teacher who is recognized for his supervisory capacity and is assigned released time to devote to the supervision of interns and by a college supervisor who makes a series of observations and works closely with the school supervisor and the intern. (Gardner, 1978, p. xi)

This definition addresses several of the criteria for defining an internship including:

1. it is a post-student teaching experience,
2. it is cooperatively planned and coordinated,
3. the intern is paid (in this case by the cooperating local education agency) and has a contract,
4. the intern has a "carefully planned" and reduced teaching load,
5. enrolled in courses (in this college-sponsored) related to the teaching responsibilities,
6. the internship lasts one year,
7. the intern is supervised by a teacher who is released some amount of time to supervise the intern(s),
8. a college supervisor also supervises.

While this definition is fairly comprehensive and precise in many respects it is obvious that there is grist for much further dialogue and debate as well. Unanswered questions include: how much should the intern be paid and by whom, what degree of reduced teaching load for both intern and intern supervisor, what type of contract, how much, and what type of parallel study and offered by who, what types of collaboration by which agencies, and is this a pre- or post-certification experience? Historically, for example, some internships led to the baccalaureate while others were graduate degree programs. The internship was a salaried position at some points in its history whereas at other times the intern was not paid for the services provided.

Thus, a wide range of internship schemes could fall within the above definition. Our bias is for an internship scheme to be post-baccalaureate but pre-certification with state guided consortia charged with deciding the specifics relative to the questions enunciated above. One might

attach minimal time requirements to an internship, say from six months to one year, but it would seem most accommodative if it reflected the amount of time needed to meet desired entry-level abilities and thus was kept somewhat open-ended say up to two and even three years. While many of the initial efforts to confront the problems of the beginning teacher were of an internship nature, in retrospect, it appears that many times the problems of the beginning teacher were not directly addressed via the internship but rather the internship was forged as a result of larger social and economic issues.

Social and economic conditions and teacher supply have historically played a major role in the design of internships in teacher education. The Association for Student Teaching Yearbook identified three distinct eras in the development of the internship in education: 1900-1930, 1930-1940, and 1940-1967.

During the period of 1900-1930, the social conditions were progressive, the economy was inflationary, and enrollment in secondary schools increased dramatically. The American education system was faced with a severe teacher shortage and thus the internship became a vital part of the preservice education of teachers. Teachers were needed in schools as soon as possible. The schools provided fiscal support for the services of the intern who also received a nominal salary for the services he or she provided (Shaplin & Powell, 1964; Brown, 1911; Jacobs, 1909; Hall-Quest, 1924; Jones, Cress & Carley, 1941).

Basically, during this period internships were established as a one-year extension of the two-year normal school program. The growing emphasis on the value of providing the teacher candidate with extended experience in the methods of teaching fueled by the shortage of teachers provided the impetus for the creation of many "internship" programs. During the internship (third year) the most able students were assigned to regular elementary teachers in cooperating schools. The interns were supervised by the normal school staff who continued to plan course work for them as well. They also received a salary for their services (Spaulding, 1955). Although the internship provided the public schools with much needed teachers while the intern completed academic preparation, there were limitations. Actual supervision of the interns was minimal and there was limited articulation of the program between the normal schools and the cooperating public schools.

During the same time there were some exceptions to the normal school's internship. In 1909 Brown University in Rhode Island established the first recognized internship program which extended beyond the B.A. or B.S. degree. This program provided an exemplar for most internships in secondary education. The five following principles established by the National Society of College Teachers of Education structured the internship. Accordingly, the intern will:

1. serve in a professional laboratory facility designed for observation and participation by prospective teachers,
2. conduct research and experimentation in child growth and development and in the use of instructional materials and teaching procedures,

3. test and demonstrate forward-looking school practices,
4. enrich the program of graduate studies in education by providing insights to the practical application of the method of teaching, and
5. exercise leadership in in-service education programs for teachers (Jacobs, 1909, p. 533).

As one can see there was an attempt in this situation to make the internships somewhat experimental and innovative in nature and put the post-baccalaureate teacher immediately in charge of further training other teachers as is outlined in number five. This internship appeared to be as much for "leadership" training as it was an experience designed to accommodate the needs of the beginning teacher.

These same principles were later identifiable in both secondary and elementary teacher training programs. Cincinnati, Boston, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Seattle, Buffalo, and Gary operated intern programs by the end of the second decade. By the late twenties, internships were considered a vital part of the preparation of teachers by providing increased supervision for beginning teachers during their first year of employment.

This graduate internship was not without problems, however. (A close examination of the goals suggests some may have been built in.) The most common problems centered around; 1) the very heavy academic load carried by the fifth-year student, 2) the difficult task of providing the close and careful supervision within the schools, and, 3) the fact that any appreciable expansion of the internship was impossible without a substantial increase of funds, the involvement of many (different) co-operating schools (Hall-Quest, 1924).

In a second distinct period—1930 to 1940—austerity was preeminent. The American economy, attempting to recover from the market crash, could not adequately appropriate monies for public education. School expansion diminished and a marked decrease in teacher turnover resulted in a large teacher surplus.

Because of the teacher surplus, public schools at this time often employed certified beginning teachers as interns *without salary*. The schools maintained that they were providing the intern with valuable training. The schools might then offer the intern a regular teaching position the following year. Many beginning teachers accepted this role because it offered a possible avenue to employment and did provide extended experience in the classroom. Thus the internship moved from basically preservice (for teachers not yet having a degree) to more inservice (for teachers with a normal school certificate or college degree as in the model piloted at Brown). The internship now commonly became a required phase of the initial inservice education of beginning teachers who worked one-half days in the schools and often received no remuneration for their services. Supervision moved more from the hands of training institutions to the schools (Jones, Cress & Carley, 1941).

At the end of this period some of the specifics of internships became

more clear. Howard Jones (1941) conducted a comprehensive study of twenty-one programs in 1940 and found considerable consensus regarding the following major functions of internships during this era:

1. To secure integration of theory and practice in the professional education of teachers.
2. To insure that the beginnng teacher secures his first year's experience in a school situation conducive to professional growth.
3. To provide a scheme of teacher induction (note: induction is used already here) in which there is adequate and competent supervision at the time of induction.
4. To provide a program of professional preparation of teachers in which learning is based upon doing.
5. To permit gradual induction in the work of teaching (p. 31).

Just what was meant by integration of theory and practice, gradual induction into teaching, systematic supervision and correlated course work is not altogether clear, but these were common characteristics to some extent. For example, induction into teaching was clearly evident in the intern program sponsored by the Oklahoma City Public Schools where the interns were supervised by the principal, master teachers, and members of the regular supervisory staff. The school system also offered special courses which were taught by the superintendent and intern supervisors (Jones, Cress, & Carley, 1941). The intern program at Northwestern University provided systematic supervision through a joint effort of the university and the cooperating school. Northwestern also provided coordinated course work with the internship experience by including one summer session of graduate study prior to the internship and one summer session following the internship period.

The most fundamental change during the thirties, however, was a focus on the internship as inservice education rather than preservice education. This change is captured by the statement of Shaplin (1964). "The internships of the thirties sought, with few exceptions, to make better beginning teachers of already certified college graduates" (p. 177).

The internships also became more diverse during this period with different institutions sponsoring internships (but apparently with not a lot of "collaboration"). In addition to the normal school, college or university-sponsored internship, more public school systems also sponsored internships as did some private institutions such as the Graduate Teachers College of Winnetka, the Cooperative School for teachers in New York City, and the Shady Hill School in Cambridge, Massachusetts. There were also a few cooperative ventures by a public school system and college or university.

Jones, Cress, and Carley (1941) also identified some basic areas of concern which emerged during the period of 1930-1940. They stated that 1) there should be a contractual agreement between the intern and the cooperating school, 2) the intern should have status comparable to the regular teachers relative to staff, pupil, and community relations, 3) the

intern should be compensated for services sufficient to cover minimum living expenses and, 4) the length of the internship should be determined by the progress made by the intern rather than an arbitrary length of time.

In a third distinct era—1940 to 1967—social and economic conditions once again changed dramatically. A focus on basic production and the maintenance of a strong program of national defense were characteristics of this era. World War II, the continuous threat of other conflicts, as well as the space race resulted in vast social and technological changes. The population explosion innundated the schools with young learners. There was, once again, a critical shortage of teachers.

There has been a long-standing need to provide the teacher candidate in pre-service programs with more and better clinical experiences. However, teacher education programs during this era were not modified accordingly. Internships, rather, took on another form once again fueled by the need for teachers and because of the increased involvement of the federal government in higher education. Towards the end of this era the federal government provided financial support to internship programs. Programs, such as Teacher Corps, had as a primary objective the recruitment of liberal arts graduates with little or no undergraduate preparation in education into intern-type teacher education programs. Their concern was not a restructuring of undergraduate programs but rather an attempt to recruit more competent individuals into teaching, especially minorities who otherwise would not have taught. They did not directly address the problems of the beginning teacher interns with an expanded preservice program but of necessity developed a modified and abbreviated program having an in-depth school/community experience. We should add that the Teacher Corps today has altered its focus in line with the times and provides one of the better models for inducting teachers into the classroom.

Fifth-year and Master of Arts in Teaching or Masters in Education programs also proliferated as another example of actually abbreviating the amount of initial professional preparation but relying on school-based internships. Certainly, the financial support and programmatic design that provided for a gradual induction into teaching were not in evidence during this period.

A 1968 review of the existing internship programs identified the following commonalities. In general, internship programs were:

1. Designed primarily to extend the professional laboratory experiences during which the teacher candidate could assume greater professional responsibility.
2. Graduate programs leading to a master's degree.
3. Considered to have a reduced teaching load from one-half to four-fifths that of a full time teacher.
4. To provide the intern with a salary proportionate to the beginning teacher's salary paid by the local public school or a supporting foundation.

5. To provide supervision of interns by persons from the local schools and persons from the sponsoring teacher education institution, all who had special training or preparation in supervision (pp. 10-11).

Perhaps the key here is that many of these internships were graduate programs, that is Masters in Education programs for persons who had received a baccalaureate in some other field of study. A common arrangement was one academic year of study sandwiched between two summers of study. Part, if not all of the academic year consisted of a paid "internship." One can clearly see this was not a time of thinking through a more protracted and conceptually sound program beginning during the baccalaureate and extending beyond.

Thus, internships of this era can be classified as either a graduate internship or an undergraduate internship, but the emphasis was on the former. These graduate internships were, for the most part, established with the assistance of external financial aid. Harap (1962) in a study sponsored by the U.S.O.E. reported that "the chief sources of external direct aid were the Federal Government, State agencies, foundations, philanthropic organizations, and business institutes" (p. 3).

There were some undergraduate internships, on the other hand, which consisted of a four to five-year sequence of professional training beginning as early as the freshman year complete with academic and clinical experiences leading to teaching certification or licensure and a bachelor's degree. As an intern the student was, in some instances, paid for the services rendered and closely supervised by both a university supervisor and an intern consultant. Examples of the undergraduate internship are programs developed by Central Michigan University, Michigan State University, and Colorado State College.

Some programs accommodate both the graduate and undergraduate student. In the Wisconsin Improvement Program, developed at the University of Wisconsin, an intern may be either a graduate or undergraduate. The work of the intern or "resident" as the Wisconsin Improvement Program terms the student is coordinated by a residency team. The team consists of: 1) the resident, 2) an advisor (team chairperson), 3) the school principal, 4) the cooperating teacher, 5) a university consultant, and 6) university course instructor(s). The intern (resident) plans an individualized program in consultation with the advisor. The plan is then submitted to all residency team members for approval. During the implementation of the coursework portion of the plan, members of the residency team are consulted to refine the tasks and identify specific teaching competencies. Concurrently the resident carries out practicum responsibilities which consist of no more than one-half of the normal teaching load in a given school. The intern is paid approximately 50% of the beginning teacher salary for the responsibilities assumed during the practicum. Upon completion of the coursework and practicum experience the resident presents evidence of competence attained including a final oral examination.

The Wisconsin Improvement Program is a consortium for Teacher education. It stresses the partnership of colleges, universities, school

systems, and the State Department of Public Instruction. Although initiated in 1960 it is perhaps more characteristic of the era 1968-1978.

Current programs in the era of the late 1960's and 1970's have been punctuated by terms such as consortium, cooperation, and collaboration. Spiraling inflation, movements to conserve the environment and energy, together with declining school enrollments and a teacher surplus have demanded more unified efforts. The teacher internship programs of this era exemplify the collaborative nature of educational ventures.

For example, even the title of some programs indicate the shared responsibility. The University of New Mexico-Albuquerque Public Schools Teacher Exchange Program is one such title. This program requires cooperation between the University and the public schools at administrative, instructional, and supervisory levels. The effort results in a teacher education program that extends from preservice to inservice. In the words of the program description (1978) "From the preservice level, through an internship, to inservice training, the program attempts to help teachers grow conceptually as they become students of teaching and learning"(p. 2).

The interns in this program have been selected as an outstanding student teacher in the preservice program and after graduation become a graduate fellow at the University of New Mexico. These highly selected interns then staff regular classrooms in tandem under the supervision of an intern supervisor (a master teacher jointly selected by the University and the public schools and released from classroom responsibilities to conduct the clinical supervision and to pursue as well further coursework at the University themselves). The interns receive a stipend from the public schools and tuition waivers from the University. This program provides not only a reasonable induction into the teaching profession, but financial support and a graduate degree as well for not only the beginning student but the experienced teacher.

Another example of a cooperative effort is that of the Arizona Teacher Residency Program. A consortium of representatives from Arizona state universities, Arizona Education Association, the Arizona Federation of Teachers, the Arizona School Administrators, the Arizona School Boards Association, and the Arizona State Board of Education was formed to increase the effectiveness and professionalism of beginning teachers through the design of an internship program which would be in addition to the normal four-year teacher preparation program. The program activities focus on 1) orientation to the school and community, 2) survival skills of classroom management and organization, and 3) professional growth, evaluation, and self-renewal activities. The residency program is based upon the following policy set by the Arizona State Board of Education:

> The State Board, pursuant to ARS 15/102, issues a Temporary Certificate which is valid for two years and is non-renewable, designed to provide for the professional improvement needs of the young developing professionals. During this two year intern program, the teacher will have available

the expertise of the district and the teacher training institution. Successful completion of four semesters of an intern program will culminate in a district and university recommendation of a Basic Certificate. Each teacher education institution is requested to submit to the State Board of Education a two-year intern program for consideration and eventual approval by the State Board of Education. (SBE APPROVED 1/7/74 - A.G. APPROVED 1/27/74).

What is of import here is the governmental involvement in the initiation or development of the intern program. This increased involvement and exploration by various governmental agencies is characteristic of the 1968-1978 era.

The Arizona Teacher Residency Program also makes a deliberate point of distinguishing between "internship" and "residency." "The internship is a period during which teachers are under the jurisdiction of the college or university for a supervised student teaching experience. The residency, however, is a period in which teachers refine and expand their knowledge base and technical skills while they are gainfully employed and assume regular teaching responsibilities. In addition, the residency involves the teaching profession in the training, evaluation, and ultimate certification of the beginning teacher. Inherent in this scheme is the conviction that teaching is a profession, the practitioners should have a significant role in determining appropriate professional training and readiness for entry into the profession.

The state of Florida is another example where a governmental agency has been centrally involved in the development of a teacher internship program. A 1978 Florida law (CSSB 549) requires that beginning July 1, 1981 all individuals desiring Florida teacher certification will have completed one year of satisfactory teaching or completed a year-long internship approved by the state. The Full Year Internship Teacher Education Act of 1978 provides guidelines for training leading to certification. The internship in the main is to verify that the candidate can satisfactorily demonstrate "essential teaching competencies." In addition, the law authorizes the allocation of funds for salaries to be paid to interns and the direct costs of district administration, supervision, and evaluation of interns and the internship program.

The induction of newly trained teachers into the profession is also of concern in other countries. In England, Ray Bolam and Keith Baker (1976) noted, "The Government have accepted in principle that there should be a national scheme of induction on the lines of that [James] Report, but the date on which such a scheme can be introduced must depend on economic circumstances." The Department of Education and Science (DES) have subsequently sponsored a number of pilot schemes to study the practical problems involved in the induction process. The pilot schemes focus upon 1) a reduced teaching load for probationers (interns), 2) the appointing and training of working teachers as teacher-tutors to help the probationers within the schools, and 3) the academic courses for probationers at centers external to the school.

The preliminary evaluation reports on the British induction models

identified the reduced teaching load for the probationer as the most valuable single feature. The teaching load for the probationer ranged from 50% to 75% of the normal load, with the remaining time spent on in-school activities as well as center-based (university) activities. Although problems were identified in the useage of the time not spent in teaching the participants felt that clearer policy could be set to ameliorate this discrepancy.

It is interesting to note that both probationers and tutors found the induction phase as valuable, yet they felt it could be strengthened. Bolam and Baker (1976) wrote:

> Although the training function was a part of their original job specification, most tutors were often reluctant to carry it out, especially when it meant observing probationers teaching. Both new and experienced teachers often regard this as a threat to professional status and autonomy. This attitude is frequently associated with a view of probation as a period to be "survived" and "coped with" rather than as one of professional growth and development. Until teachers genuinely accept this latter view, the teacher-tutors are likely to meet with resistance in their attempts to implement a training role (p. 3).

Indeed, a poignant statement as we prepare to explore models of induction into the teaching profession.

This cursory historical review has attempted to show that; 1) there have been attempts to accommodate the beginning teacher commonly through internship, 2) the teacher internship is not a new idea, 3) the internship has been influenced by political, economic, and social climates in general and teacher supply in particular and thus in some respects has not directly addressed the needs of the beginning teacher and, 4) the internship has slowly evolved into a more diverse and comprehensive notion that is supported by various constituents. The remaining chapters in the book will attempt to show that current educational ferment should include yet a closer examination of how the needs of the beginning teacher can best be met including a fuller exploration of the concepts of internships and residencies.

REFERENCES

Bolam, R. & Baker, K. Helping new teachers: The induction year. *DES Reports on Education*. No. 86; March 1976.

Brown, J.F. *The training of teachers*. New York: Macmillan Co. 1911.

Bush, R.N. *A new source of energy for teacher education: Collaboration*. An unpublished position paper, Stanford University, December 1978.

Denemark, G., Morsink, C.V., & Thomas, C.C. *Accepting the challenge for change in teacher education*. A draft of a position paper for the National Support System Project. March 1979.

Gardner, H. *Internships in teacher education: Forty-seventh yearbook 1968*. Washington D.C.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1968.

Hall-Quest, A. The Cincinnati plan of teacher training. *Educational Administration and Supervision*. 10:129-41; March 1924.

Harap, H. *Fifth-year programs of classroom teacher education: A digest of the survey report*. Washington D.C.: Division of Higher Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 1962.

Howey, K.R., Yarger, S.J. & Joyce, B.R. *Improving teacher education*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1978.

Jacobs, W.B. *Practice teaching at Brown University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1909.

Jones, H.R. Principles and practices in internships. A paper presented at the Twenty-First Annual Session of the National Association of Supervisors of Student Teaching. Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1941.

Jones, H.R., Cress, C. & Carley, V.A. Descriptions of internship programs. A paper presented at the Twenty-First Annual Session of the National Association of Supervisors of Student Teaching. Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1941.

NEA Research Memo. *Teacher supply and demand in public schools*. Washington D.C.: National Education Association, June, 1977.

Reynolds, Maynard. *A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of P.L. 94-142 to teacher education*. A draft of a position paper for the National Support System Project, March 1979.

Shaplin, J.T. & Powell, A.G. A comparison of internship programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 15:174-76; June 1964.

Smith, A.M. Reaction: *Toward an enlargement of general principles*. A draft of a position paper for the National Support System Project. March 1979.

Spaulding, F.E. *School superintendent in action*. Rindge, New Hampshire: Richard E. Smith Publishing, 1955.

State survey: AACTE leaders report on state legislative trends. *Legislative Briefs* Vol. V, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, February, 1979.

Stoltenberg, J.C. *The Teacher Internship of the Wisconsin Improvement Program: 1978-80 Guidelines*. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Improvement Program, 1978.

The Arizona Teacher Residency Program. Unpublished program description, 1978.

University of New Mexico-Albuquerque Public Schools: APS-UNM Teacher-Intern Exchange Program. Unpublished program description, 1978.

A TALK WITH BEGINNING TEACHERS

Kenneth Howey
and
Richard Bents

In the spring of the year four beginning teachers (randomly selected) were contacted by the editors to see if they would share some of their perceptions about their first year of teaching. They were provided a modest stipend to attend a session where they were told the primary purpose was to examine any special problems that arise as one begins teaching and to explore ways in which these might be alleviated.

Different names have been utilized to preserve the anonymity of these beginning teachers. One teacher, who we shall call Martin, taught mathematics in an inner-city junior high school. A second, Charlotte, taught intermediate age-kids in an open-space, team-taught arrangement in an urban school. A third, Rachel, taught kindergarten in a suburban parochial school, and a fourth, Karen, also taught in a primary situation in a surburban location.

Our intent can hardly be to draw any hard and fast conclusions. We did, however, think a dialogue with the beginning teachers was a graphic means of illustrating some of the kinds of problems which do exist. The dialogue, then, should allow you, the reader, an opportunity to reflect upon the types of problems and concerns this small group of beginning teachers identified.

There is no assurance that these beginning teachers are in any way typical. It is quite likely, however, that the type of teacher preparation programs which they completed and the types of school settings in which they are teaching are not that uncommon.

While we hope the reader will make his or her own inferences or perhaps better, sharpen his or her questions about problems and potential solutions in initial teaching, there are some obvious themes which evolved throughout this brief dialogue. Regardless of the specific question which the editors raised common responses reoccurred. What is lacking in a transcription of verbal interaction such as this is the emotional intensity which was very evident and attached to such concerns as: considerable demands on their time, their concern for "honest" feedback, their need for being accepted . . . by the faculty and by the kids, wondering how to figure out "the system," and their need for more private and personal counsel. Obviously not all beginning teachers experience the same problems and the same pressures and to the same degree, but the considerable consensus among these four teachers who teach in quite different situations, suggests that these are readily identifiable concerns— concerns which are largely *not* attended to.

KEN: As you know the primary reason that we wanted to chat with you is to help think through how we might better accommodate the needs of the beginning teacher. Are there any particular needs or problems that come readily to mind?

MARTIN: Okay, I'll start out. I guess the two areas that really have become evident to me—where I feel I really could use some more help—are discipline and individualizing instruction. The reason I say that is because I'm at a school in a situation that is - quote - untraditional. As a beginning teacher I'm working with only "low ability" students and I'm dealing with a lot of those students that have problems, whether they be academic or behavior or discipline. These students, I have *not* been prepared for. I believed that I was rated to accommodate, to deal with, the normal kinds of behavior problems that occur in a regular classroom—but not this situation. The problems that I've come up against are much more complex than any that I've just ever had to deal with before and that's the one reason I feel inadequate. Also, I never realized just how much I would have to individualize. I can't teach the group as a class. I have to work with individual students and set up individual programs. I thought I was familiar with how to individualize through my initial training, but a lot of the things I'm doing and using I've come across through my own personal reading and investigation. I think if I only relied on what I learned in my course work, I would be much more lost than I am right now.

DICK: Can you give me an example of the kinds of behavioral problems you didn't anticipate? Talk to us about the "real world" of junior high.

MARTIN: Just outright disrespect. There is a lot of name calling, even fist fighting, right in the classroom, just physical and harsh kinds of behavior. I think most teachers are prepared to deal with the talking and not working—those kinds of things. But I'm especially talking about really very *immediate* kinds of behaviors that call for quick action. You can't just say "please stop that" and it will go away. I really feel I could have used not only more preparation but support in the classroom from others in the school.

RACHEL: I'd have to agree with that even though the school I'm at is not untraditional. It's very traditional, and the children are younger. The parents at St. Matthews demand discipline. I'd have to agree with Martin, because I felt I never had a class or even an opportunity in student teaching that dealt with specific discipline problems and then had teachers responding to it so you could study the strategies or techniques for dealing with behavior. That is one area that I had anticipated that I would have some problems with, and, while it probably isn't as severe as Martin's problem, this consumes a lot of my energies. I worry about how my classroom is managed. I can't be ready by just having good lessons.

KEN: Can you talk further about this?

RACHEL: Well, there is one little boy who is constantly a behavior problem, I mean he can't get along with other people— he doesn't say nice things—sometimes he hits other kids. It's been a problem all year, and it's been basically on my own that I have had to deal with him. I've talked to the principal and to his mom, but I really wish I would have had some more preparation for doing this. I feel very inadequate in talking with them.

DICK: How might you have been better prepared? Is this something you can only be prepared for to a certain extent, that you have to learn to some degree on-the-job?

MARTIN: I think my preparation was adequate in terms of dealing with students that respond to verbal interventions. However, my students often don't respond to the verbal. They respond to more dramatic kinds of actions and behaviors that are much more obvious. I think that if I would have been exposed to more ways of interacting with students, I would have been much better off. This real disruptive behavior just came as a real shock to me. I know now that I'm coping with it better, because I have to deal with it every day, but it has been pretty much baptism by fire.

KAREN: I think the biggest problems are time management, placing kids at their appropriate levels and organization of the classroom in general. I never felt like I was lacking ideas for things to do. I think I came out of teacher preparation with a lot of that. It was just a matter of how to put it to work—how to take thirty kids at different levels and needs and service them all. We need more time. We're pressing to get things done.

CHARLOTTE: I guess organization is the biggest problem in just becoming familiar with how to provide for so many kids. In the open program there is a lot of scheduling and being responsible to so many other people for that schedule—it was difficult at first.

DICK: What specifically was done, either by you or by others to address those problems?

CHARLOTTE: As far as the scheduling and organizing time I really don't think I was given much help. I guess I had to watch and observe other teachers that I was working with directly. There was never any one who said specifically you can come and observe how I do this, but being in such close contact with other classrooms and lessons being done all around you in the open situation I could sometimes observe what was going on. I really learned by jumping in.

DICK: Were your observations systematic in any way?

CHARLOTTE: No. When I had time, then "brief glances." I would have appreciated more time to observe, a more systematic approach, more chances to talk with other faculty.

KAREN: I would have liked to have done more observing in other classrooms while I was here at the U and definitely have done more student teaching. I did two quarters half days, and I don't feel that was enough. I could have benefited from a lot more classroom experiences earlier in the program too.

KEN: Are you suggesting, then, that whatever field experiences and student teaching that you did was not enough to adequately prepare you for total responsibility in the classroom? We are all aware that beginning teaching can't fully prepare you.

KAREN: It was good, but it wasn't enough.

KEN: It didn't give you a really accurate picture?

MARTIN: Not really, no.

DICK: Is part of it the degree of responsibility you now have— was there a transition from student teaching to now in terms of the magnitude of responsibility itself?

MARTIN: I don't think so. I would disagree with that because I felt my student teaching and my pre-student teaching experience prepared me really well. I have no complaints at all about that. I worked with individual students in my program before I student taught in an inner-city school. Then I student taught in both an inner-city senior high and junior high, so I felt I was exposed to a lot of things. I guess maybe that is one reason why I'm really kind of surprised that I am having problems. I feel that my student teaching prepared me pretty well, but then perhaps . . . no, I can't fault my student teaching. They gave me a lot of responsibilities in student teaching.

DICK: Maybe it still wasn't enough?

MARTIN: No, I think it was enough. I can't say it wasn't enough *responsibility*. It was more a matter of more in-depth preparation for certain things.

KAREN: I guess I would basically have to agree with that. I was really satisfied with my student teaching, in fact, my whole undergraduate educational career. Individualization and discipline really haven't been a problem for me, it has been more establishing relationships in working with the rest of the staff. We have been trying to develop a team teaching situation, and, although I felt that I knew how to work in that situation, actually doing it became very difficult for me. I felt, for a long time, that people didn't understand and appreciate my expertise and my skills, and I suppose, in turn, that I haven't fully appreciated nor understood the wisdom that comes from experience in the classroom. And that became very frustrating for me.

RACHEL: Actually, I felt very confident going out after student teaching —that wasn't the problem—but it didn't prepare me for the *range* of

activities and the total scope of things that were going to happen the first year. And I don't really know how much could have been done about that. I just want to emphasize again that I would like to have much more in overall management and organization and specifically student discipline. It is such a major problem for teachers. Why can't there be a program where you do observing in a variety of different schools—like traditional, non-traditional, inner-city and suburban. I would also recommend a class where you could look at many video tapes of discipline situations, role played, for example. But mostly observing in a lot of classroom situations, because I feel it's important.

CHARLOTTE: I think my training at the university was definitely geared to a self-contained classroom situation, so there were many adjustments I had to make in this team teaching open school approach. I'm not going to have a group of kids that I'm going to be responsible throughout the day for, that I can keep contact with. Assuming responsibility for 125 children instead of 30 was a difficult thing even though I don't see all of them every day. When I do have them I am responsible and there has to be a communication. Like if a child is having problems in the morning, then I have to get to the next teacher and let him know that he has to be watched right now. We have to share responsibility as teachers, and I feel that the university didn't prepare me for that—my teacher training didn't prepare me for those types of problems. I think one other thing that would be beneficial is if there was some kind of a list of references or resources you could go to for that or when there are special day events like Arbor Day and this type of thing where there are always special plans and preparations made up. I think I have found out about some of these but often times too late. One needs a "district" and "community" awareness.

KAREN: A basic problem is just knowing where to go for materials. I knew something was available. I heard of this or heard of that but just knowing who to contact for what, especially within the city or the district, but even within the school, is a problem.

MARTIN: I wasn't given an adequate orientation program. Knowing school policy as far as discipline and knowing that I will be supported by certain people in the building in dealing with discipline was a real concern.

KEN: Let's pursue for a moment the question of being accepted by the faculty, by your colleagues. How has that gone?

RACHEL: For me, it has worked out well in many ways. I admit that I was very apprehensive about this. But the people that I have come to know at the school have been supportive and friendly. In fact, the thing that I really appreciate most is that they respect my opinion much more than I thought they would. This is one thing I was really concerned about—I thought I would be played down to or even just kind of discounted as far as my opinions or ideas go, but from the principal on

down, I felt the people have listened to what ideas I have. If there is a problem, I don't think there has been a really sort of critical feedback or dialogue about what I'm doing. People like me and, I think, respect me, but it is general support that doesn't address real specifics.

MARTIN: When I started this fall, there was a big turnover in teachers. There were five of us new teachers. So far I have gotten most of my support from other beginning teachers. I think others accept us, but there really isn't much time to talk with anyone. I mean I am busy almost every night. I hardly get to see my girl friend (laughter).

KAREN: I think the school staff as a whole has been just excellent. The counselors, social workers, principals, other teachers, they have really been helpful. I think they just give support just by being friendly and open to my problems. And I've had some of them talk to me especially the first few weeks, and they say, "I know this is going to be rough for you at first. Just do your best. Don't let it worry you.", those kind of comments and things like that have really made it so much more bearable than if I wouldn't have had that kind of support. I think that my family has provided me with a lot of support, because there are days when you come home, and I think I just can't go back there. So, just being able to talk it over with other people is really nice.

CHARLOTTE: One way that the university indirectly provided support has been that the graduates from last year's program get together on their own and about once a month just to discuss our problems and our situations and share ideas. It's been a very helpful way to kind of open up our problems and concerns and to get new ideas too from others in similar situations.

KAREN: Both of my parents are teachers, so they know a lot of the problems. When I go home they have been able to help me, and I also have a lot of close friends that I'm still keeping up with from the University, like Jean, and we share a lot of our problems together.

KEN: Speaking of parents how have your relationships with parents gone?

KAREN: I haven't had any problems at all. I started the year by visiting each of the homes just to see where the kids come from and get to know the parents a little bit better. I did this because I was so new I didn't really know any of the families or anything in the area. So that started things off on a real good foot. I followed up later when we had conferences. I knew them before they came in, so it breaks the ice a little bit. I only wish I had more time to do this. It did take an awful lot of my time especially in the fall.

MARTIN: I've had some communication with the parents, and most of the time I've had to initiate that communication. The parents of my students may be interested in the school, but the actual response to invitations has been very poor. We had an open house about two weeks

ago, and I had just a handful of parents that came. Maybe this is also due in part to the kinds of students that I have. Their parents would just as soon not have to deal with some of their school problems in an open house or a conference or whatever. The times that I have called parents, however, I basically have gotten good support from them.

RACHEL: Parents are really involved at St. Matthews. There is always a large turn out at any school function that we have. I try to keep up communication by putting out a weekly newsletter to let them know what is happening in the classroom. They really appreciate that.

CHARLOTTE: If you want to know the truth, the first time I sat down with a parent at a conference, I was terrified. It has gotten better, but it's not always easy to talk to parents about a problem.

DICK: Does the principal make formal observations and visits, or do you come into contact with curriculum specialists or resources teachers?

KAREN: I've had only one formal observation from the principal. She came in to see what was happening. I did hand in my lesson plans to her from the first week up to Christmas. She wanted to see that. We do have a librarian who is super. She orders films and everything for us, and we have library time in there. There is a Title I Aide who I send three of the boys down to every morning, and that's some extra help.

MARTIN: I haven't been observed by the principal, but I have been observed by the assistant principals because of the discipline problem and also by the math coordinator for the district. I've had to call the assistant principals down for help in discipline problems quite often during my first tri-mester at the school, so they pretty much know what I'm doing even though they haven't made a formal observation.

CHARLOTTE: I've been in a federal program where we have a lot of contact with the director of the program. I've also made an effort to go to the district office and look up some materials and things too. It's been kind of a two-way street. The project people came in and observed me, but I've made an effort as well to go get information or see people.

KEN: How often would you like the principal or perhaps someone else to provide focused supervision?

KAREN: I like the fact that I am basically on my own, she really lets you be free to do what you want. She is very flexible; I can go to her with problems. She doesn't observe much, but she is supportive.

RACHEL: The principal's in my room a lot—many times she's just walking in and walking out. Other times she sits down and takes part in the lessons and sometimes she will help with a child or whatever. The only problem with that is that I never received any type of formalized feedback unless I specifically would ask for it, which I did occasionally. I especially liked the one visit where I received feedback. I asked her to come in and observe the little boy who I was having trouble with, so we

had a conference about that afterwards, and she was supportive. I asked her for some advice about what to do, and she gave me some helpful ideas.

MARTIN: Once I asked for either a xerox or some notes back from the district coordinator after he observed me, because I felt he had some good comments. He had just kind of told them to me off the cuff. I didn't have anything in writing, so I just kind of relied on my memory to think back and to try to implement some of those suggestions. I guess that's one area where I think it is really important to get even just a few things scribbled down. . . to get something written, because it is so easy for the next day to go by, and a whole new set of problems and experiences go through your head, and a lot of that stuff is lost. I think it is really important to get some kind of specific feedback.

DICK: Have you had the chance to see people actually demonstrating different teaching techniques?

CHARLOTTE: Yes, I have. The Title I reading supervisor has come and taught lessons and given me materials right there on the spot. I would like more in other areas and want opportunities to watch other teachers teach.

KAREN: We've had a workshop that did some demonstration lessons that I felt were helpful. But this was only a one time thing. I attended also a multi-cultural workshop earlier in the year, and I was given two days off to go to that, and I found that to be very helpful.

RACHEL: I haven't seen any actual demonstrations with kids.

MARTIN: Neither have I, but as I said before I would like this.

KEN: Were there ever any attempts by anyone to identify what problems specifically you might be having before they planned inservice activities for you?

KAREN: No. Not really.

MARTIN: Not that I can recall.

CHARLOTTE: I've had other teachers come to me, and they've said, "I know what kind of students you have—why don't you try this . . . why don't you do that." They haven't said that as criticism, but rather as, "Maybe I could help you out here.", and that's really been good. But other than that no one has asked me what my problems have been.

DICK: Have any of you seen yourself on video tape?

MARTIN: Yes, but not since I finished student teaching.

RACHEL: No. I never had this kind of opportunity.

DICK: Would this be helpful?

MARTIN: Yes. I guess I'm curious. After seeing myself student teaching, I think maybe seeing myself in my present situation might bring a new perspective, and I think it would be helpful.

CHARLOTTE: I would like it, but it might be difficult to schedule and even more difficult to get somebody to sit down and view it with you.

DICK: Have either of you ever seen yourself on video?

KAREN: No.

RACHEL: Not that I recall.

DICK: Do you think it would be helpful to you in anyway if you knew what you looked like?

RACHEL: Yes. I definitely think it would be helpful.

KAREN: I think it would. I'm not sure how differently I could teach, but then I'm not sure how I'm teaching now.

KEN: Has anyone ever observed you and given you other than general kinds of feedback? When a person does observe you in a classroom, what do you find out about yourselves—what kind of feedback are you getting that provides you with more insights into your teaching?

MARTIN: As I said earlier, rather general, even vague comments, nothing that could really help me as far as making adjustments. The people were supportive.

KEN: I take the position, and have some data to support it, that supervisors are generally supportive but supportive to the point of not really being helpful. It's kind of "you're doing a good job," "this is neat," "keep that up," "keep smiling," "it's nice to have you on board," "we're all for you." Rarely does anyone get very focussed, critical or probing in terms of what you are actually doing. How does that square with your own situation?

KAREN: It sounds familiar to me.

RACHEL: Generally, I get very good comments. I've never received any really negative feedback. I get general feedback on how I am working with the kids and how the kids are responding to me.

MARTIN: I've gotten quite specific feedback from the coordinator for math in our district. He came in and observed me and then came back with comments such as: "I think these two students would be good working together."—things like that. This is one reason why I would have appreciated having some of these things coming back to me in some kind of written form, so I could keep track of more of those ideas.

CHARLOTTE: I had the same situation in student teaching. I felt that my supervisors even in student teaching didn't come to grips with the problems I had. I would have liked some of them to come in and say,

"Hey, I think this is a real problem, and I think you could work on it." But that didn't happen. They either kind of played it down, or they just didn't note it to me if they felt it was a difficult problem that I really needed to work on. Yet, when my recommendation came out, there were things in there that I was surprised to see, at least in terms of degree, if nothing else. If we had received more written feedback in a continuous kind of way no one would spring a surprise on you at the end of the year or at some time later on.

MARTIN: That's part of it, and I also ask them to be as direct as possible. That's very important. I don't think it has to come out harshly or brashly, but I think one can be very honest and say, "This is an area where I think you really need to work on. It's an area where you are still deficient at this point in time, and I would like to see some progress in this area over the next five weeks or some reasonable period of time." That would mean a lot more to me than somebody saying, 'Well, you had some problems here, but you really don't have to worry about it."

DICK: Are there any special fears or anxieties you encountered in your first year?

MARTIN: I would say that the most common fears that I experienced are of two kinds. I generally just wondered how things really worked out, you know. This my first teaching experience. You walk in, and you just don't know what's going to happen—you don't know how you're going to act now that you don't have the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor out seeing you, and so you have uncertainty as to just how well you're doing. The other kind of anxiety—maybe it was even fear—is that some students have actually threatened me personally. You know they wanted to cause me some bodily injury or threatened to sabotage my car or do things like that. This was something I just didn't expect from students. By now it's something I've sort of come to live with and play down. But I still think in the back of your mind you're always kind of wondering. It might not be fear anymore, but it's a wondering kind of a feeling.

CHARLOTTE: I was anxious, because I didn't know how the kids would accept me and how the other teachers were going to accept me, so I had some initial fear there. I am beginning to have a good time now.

KEN: As the year has gone on, do you believe that you have achieved what you thought you were going to achieve?

KAREN: Yes. Even more because I've been able to devote a lot of time to it. I really tried to make this year the best one I possibly could, because I didn't know if I'd ever teach again or be rehired.

MARTIN: (turning to Charlotte) I really appreciated your comments regarding the fear of the unknown, of wanting to be successful and not knowing how you would come out. I even got tied up inside just getting up in front of a group of students when I didn't feel prepared. I have

remained somewhat anxious all the time. At times I felt the frustration was almost unbearable, because I wasn't meeting my expectations, and there were so many areas where I was deficient.

KEN: Did you have any unduly romantic notions that were put to the test this first year?

KAREN: I think the biggest surprise to me has been the politics of job getting. How to get a job and keep a job? I don't think I was prepared for that. I thought once I got my first job, and once I had the experience, I was set.

MARTIN: I really thought parents would care more for their kids than some of them do. I thought I understood people and what causes behavior much better than I guess I do.

CHARLOTTE: I didn't have any real idea it would be as much work as it is.

MARTIN: Neither did I.

RACHEL: It's work, but I thought it would be more challenging and exciting in a different kind of way. I think I thought there would be more intellectual stimulation than there has been. You know what I mean.

DICK: What have the professional organizations contributed to you as a professional?

KAREN: I don't belong to any professional organization except the teacher's union, but I do think of myself as a professional. I believe teaching is a very important job in society. I think I get as much respect as any other professional.

KEN: As much as a doctor or lawyer?

KAREN: No. Not that much.

MARTIN: I don't feel the union is as much of a professional organization as some of the other things that I belong to such as the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics. But I don't think that any of these organizations are directly linked to whether or not you feel professional relative to your job . . .

RACHEL: I think the thing that has made me feel the most professional is the way the people in the school treated me, and the way I try to react to them. I believe that is probably the biggest thing that has made me grow and develop as a professional. The organizations and all the other things outside of school are probably part of it, but I don't think they're the primary thing.

KEN: How do you see yourself?

KAREN: I feel like a professional, but I don't think this feeling of professionalism is largely due to being a member of a professional

organization. It depends on what kind of perspective that you bring to your work.

CHARLOTTE: I think in teaching, a lot is assumed just by the faculty accepting you. I think a lot of it comes from within too—you can't always worry about what other people think. I feel professional—I think again it's your own attitude as well.

DICK: You are being treated as a professional then?

MARTIN: I don't see myself as being treated as a professional compared to some persons in other professions.

DICK: Do you feel any special pressures because of the intense competition for jobs?

CHARLOTTE: I think knowing about and hearing of cuts of positions put you in a very uncomfortable position. There is just a lot of competition and a lot of insecurity, and I think it affects your job.

KAREN: Knowing you're on the bottom of the totem pole sure doesn't help.

MARTIN: Well, I know that I'd like to add things within the building for future use or get really involved in things, but I know as of June, or whatever, I could be cut off. It's really hard to give yourself totally, I think.

RACHEL: I don't especially feel that. I'm sure I could stay at St. Matthews as long as I want. However, I'd eventually like to get into public schools because of the money. I do have my contract for next year, so I feel secure for now.

KAREN: In my situation, I have a possibility of staying on next year, but not for sure. I think it's affected my performance. I'm not sure how much. I don't think I would have acted any differently if they would have told me definitely, "You'll be here next year."

KEN: How do you think someone would feel if they didn't have strong support from their peers?

CHARLOTTE: Isolated and frustrated.

KAREN: I would agree. I think that you'd very soon get discouraged, and I also think I would get to feel isolated. It's so easy to feel isolated especially as a first year teacher, because you're so concerned with your own situation and your own lessons and your own students that a lot of times you just kind of immerse yourself in that and forget about the rest of the shcool.

MARTIN: Your sense of self-esteem is partially determined from the way you look at the job coming in but beyond that, it's largely your immediate colleagues that shape this for you. They're the ones that empathize with you and give you some feeling of what you're doing.

DICK: What do you think about beginning teachers salaries?

KAREN: I think the salary does not compensate a teacher for time, effort, and education that you put into this thing. I guess over the years, somehow, there has been a philosophy or an attitude that that's the way it is with teachers and teachers have to have this deep commitment. I've heard this for years. It gets in the way sometimes.

CHARLOTTE: I think that compared to other professions teaching is underpaid. I guess generally though it really doesn't bother me that much because teaching is a career choice. Maybe someday I'll think it's better to go into some other kind of work.

RACHEL: I don't know. It's a concern of mine now, but I think that if a person wants to teach badly enough, you can work around that. I don't think teachers salaries are totally unfair. I think you're compensated enough—I just don't think it's enough compared to other professions.

MARTIN: It would be tough for anyone with a family.

KEN: How do you think you will feel in three years?

MARTIN: I think a lot would depend on what kind of job that I would have in three years and the conditions surrounding it.

KAREN: I would say I might be less satisfied three years from now . . . if I work this hard and don't get more out of it.

CHARLOTTE: I think the first year I'm satisfied, but I think that teachers with more experience and continuing preparation expect more money than the kind of raises they get.

DICK: How do you think the kids see you as a beginning teacher? Would they generally be able to identify a beginning teacher from an experienced teacher?

RACHEL: I think the kids try out a new teacher. I think they're testing you all the time in the beginning. Maybe it's not only the beginning teacher, but any new teacher in the fall is going to be tested.

CHARLOTTE: I felt insecure, but I probably would have to some extent, regardless. I felt I was testing me more than the kids.

MARTIN: I think there is *much* more testing from the children, being a new teacher in the building.

KEN: What would an ideal kind of continuing education or support for you as beginning teacher be like?

KAREN: I think released time maybe once a week for two or three hours would be good if nothing else, because I just found that there is so much being thrown at you the first year of teaching in terms of just keeping up—just doing the daily kinds of things. In student teaching oftentimes if you had a lot of papers to correct or something you would split them up

with the cooperating teacher, and you could get through things fairly quickly. But here you're on your own, and you don't have that other person to talk with or to help out when you'd like him. I really feel pressed for time.

CHARLOTTE: In my school every Tuesday we had one-half of a day released time. Usually people came in from different curriculum areas. They brought materials to us, and that was really beneficial. I think this has been a big plus as far as support goes.

DICK: Has this been adequate?

CHARLOTTE: Well, I think it gave me as much as I could deal with at the time. I never felt a lack of ideas. The problem is just having the time to plan to use them.

KEN: How would you like a situation where you were basically teaching about two-thirds of the time during the first year or so? How would you react to that type of situation?

MARTIN: I would prefer about 80% teaching to 20% released time.

KAREN: So would I.

CHARLOTTE: I think it would be a really good idea if you did not have to worry about the financial considerations. But, I think there is something also to be said for having to learn while teaching a full day. This is something you don't get enough in student teaching, and I think just having to deal with that puts a whole new light on everything. I think that the experience of having to teach full days should be mixed in there with some full days off.

KAREN: Maybe we could just have a day off every two weeks or so.

RACHEL: That would be great!

MARTIN: I hadn't thought about it, but it would be nice if you could be paid at a full salary but not have to be in contact with the children all of the time. Periodic time off to study would be very helpful.

DICK: If you were to make any recommendations of what should be done for the beginning teacher, what might these be?

MARTIN: I think I would like to see some kind of a provision made so that new teachers could be somehow paired up with another teacher—not necessarily in the same way as student teaching, but just to have somebody that you could confide in and talk to. It is so hard to start out a job and establish those kinds of relationships. Sometimes they happen naturally, but there is a span of maybe two months before that really happens. I think that maybe if you were told to go to this person to help you, I think that would make a big difference in morale and in just getting started. We need sort of a buddy system.

KAREN: Yes. I've talked to other beginning teachers about this same thing. It would be nice to have a broader range of observations and exposure to different situations. I felt that in preservice I was given a lot of exposure to different things, and I think that is still needed; you have to get out of your own classroom more often.

CHARLOTTE: As far as preparation within a school, I'd like to see all the resource people in the building make personal contact with the new teacher and say, "This is what I'm here for, and this is what you can come to me for. I can help you with this and that." Having the real support of the staff, I guess, for me is an ideal situation. I would like someone to team with. I think it's really important that all schools have some kind of communications system between teachers.

RACHEL: I think a little more effort to let you know just how you are doing, both the good and the bad, would be the main thing?

KEN: Well, I think that is enough for one day. You have all been very helpful, and we thank you for taking the time from your busy schedules to share with us today.

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM: AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE PROFESSION

Kevin Ryan

Beginning a career is a great moment in a person's life. It is a time of high expectations, special joys and, often, punishing difficulties. In primitive cultures, young men, and sometimes young women, go through what are called rites of passage, which are tests of their strengths and endurance. A rite of passage, such as going off alone into the wilderness for an extended period, acts as the dividing line between childhood and adulthood. Without stretching the analogy too far, there are these rites or trials of fire in some professions, particularly in the helping professions of social work, nursing and teaching. The rites of passage are not formalized and often come as a distinct shock to the newcomers. The beginning social worker, filled with concern for her fellow man and good intentions, is often taken advantage of and made to feel foolish by guileful clients. The freshly trained nurses, too, have their rites of passage. Although induction patterns are changing, older nurses talk about being thrown on the ward and forced to deal with complex problems for which they have little training. They described it as a sink or swim experience. While there is still an element of this in nursing, the addition of paraprofessionals and auxiliary technicians can ease their entrance into the profession and the demands of life on the ward.

New teachers, too, have their rite of passage. Almost everyone who has attended school has either been part of it or witnessed it. In almost everyone's experience there has been a brand new teacher whose inexperience and uncertainties were detected and pounced on by some in the class. Many otherwise kind and intelligent people will convey with mirth some tale of how during their school days they and their classmates mentally tortured some first year teacher and "drove them out of the school." The view that that teacher had spent years thinking about and preparing himself for a career and they caused (or witnessed) great mental anguish and the dashing of one's careers hopes, somehow doesn't penetrate. Somehow, new teachers during their rite of passage are fair game.

There would appear to be clear agreement that there is a problem imbedded in the introduction into teaching. It is not, however, a problem that is unique to the United States Currently research and action

programs are being conducted around the entrance into teaching in both England (Bolam, 1973) and in Australia (Tischer, 1979). While there has been wide acknowledgement of the problem in the United States' schools, and a fairly constant concern expressed in the literature, only recently has there been a major effort to study the problems around entrance into teaching as a forerunner of developing programs aimed at solving the problem. Two years ago the National Institute of Education held a conference of the leadership of many different groups in education, such as principals, teachers, curriculum directors, counselors, teacher educators and others. The one issue around which this large and diverse group was in unanimous agreement was the critical nature of the new teachers introduction into teaching and the need for further research and action on this topic (Young, 1978). Shortly after that a staff member at the National Institute for Education reviewed the research that has been done on this problem and summarized it as follows:

> One result of this effort is a conclusion concurred in by thoughtful observers with a variety of background and concerns: the conditions under which a person carries out the first year of teaching has a strong influence on the level of effectiveness which that teacher is able to achieve and to sustain—over the years; on the attitudes which govern teacher behavior over even a forty-year career; and, indeed, on a decision whether or not to continue in the teaching profession (NIE, 1978).

Although it is encouraging to see wider appreciation of the problems of introduction, or more appropriately, induction into teaching and the promise of attempts at mediating these difficulties, we need a better sense of what the essential problem is.

Knowing that a problem exists is no assurance that we know why it exists. When we speak of teaching we are speaking of a mass occupation, an occupation composed of over two-and-a-half million active members and with hundreds of thousands of people who have been teachers. We can only speculate about the individual problems of such a wide and diverse group. Four such speculations are offered.

The first is that teachers have difficulty in their first year because they are essentially undertrained for the demands of their work. Over a century ago Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote some lines that could be descriptive of, albeit in caricature, teacher education. Emerson wrote, "We are students of words: we are shut up in schools, and colleges, and recitation rooms, for ten or fifteen years, and come out at last with a bag of wind, a memory of words, and we do not know a thing." While Emerson was speaking about higher education in general, his words have stinging relevance for much of teacher education. As mentioned above, teaching is a mass occupation. So is teacher education. Currently we are training approximately two hundred thousand teachers a year. While the number of teachers trained is large, the cost per "unit" is quite small. The amount of society's money that we spend on the education of a teacher is a small fraction of what we spend to train a doctor, a veterinarian, or even another member of the helping profes-

sions, a nurse. The amount of money a university spends to train a teacher is among the lowest of any category of graduates. Much of the professional training is done through large lectures. Much of the evaluation of the individual teachers is done by paper and pencil tests rather than performance tests. Although there is almost uniformly an apprenticeship, or what sociologists call a mediated entrance attached to teaching, it is quite primitive in comparison to many of the crafts and highly skilled trades. In other words, an electrician going out to work on his own has had a much richer and carefully supervised entrance into his work. He has gone through a chain of training experiences and opportunities with different individuals and under varying conditions. On the other hand the new teacher often has only a semester or quarter of student teaching, an experience notorious for its lack of definition and range of effectiveness. The sociologist, Dan C. Lortie, (1975) in speaking of the induction system into teaching made the following statement:

> Our review of schooling, mediated entry, and learning-while-doing in teaching reveals that the total induction system is not highly developed. Teaching does not require as much preparation as some professions, crafts, or other skilled fields. Teaching is relatively high on general schooling and somewhat low on specialized schooling. Mediated entry is limited; a few weeks of practice teaching are outmatched in lower ranked occupations. Induction after work has begun generally takes the form of continued college study; provisions for additional training within school systems are sparse. One is struck both by the heavy reliance upon formal classroom instructions and by the protracted subordination of the teacher to persons who, properly speaking, are not members of the occupation (pp. 60-61).

So, the very nature of the training may create the potential for a difficult transition into the world of work.

Another related source to the problem is selection in teaching. Compared to other occupations and professions, teaching has quite low standards of selection. The primary selection criteria into teacher training is a grade point average. However, rarely is the grade point average standards a serious barrier to aspirants. The second, and less clear criteria, is what might be called the absence of antisocial attitudes. Put a bit more positively, teacher training programs typically look for some indication that the potential teacher "likes children" and will be a "positive role model" for the young. While these qualities are important, the test of these qualities is usually superficial and unsystematic. Since those selecting people into training and those doing the actual training for teaching do not have clear and defensible criteria of what constitutes the good teacher, a few people are screened out. "Said another way, large numbers of people with diverse attitudes and widely varying characteristics enter the schools not having been tested for the demands and challenges of the profession in any rigorous fashion."

Another reason why the first year of teaching is a problem is that the new teacher has necessarily had a general training. Universities and colleges do not train their preservice teachers for specific jobs in specific schools. While some institutions provide special training for urban

schools, that is a rarity rather than the rule. Typically, an elementary education program would train a primary school teacher to teach at a range of grades, and supposedly, in a range of settings. So, too, for a social studies teacher. While this sounds attractive in the abstract, it often breaks down in the concrete situation. The phenomenon of schooling varies immensely in our society. Recently, Russell Doll (1977) has reported research on the great range of elementary schools in one city. Doll found the schools could be classified into four types ranging from those that were clearly preparing children to do college preparatory work that emphasized mastering of traditional content and that were well organized and highly task oriented, through innovative schools that tried to respond to a broader array of educational goals to schools that struggled, to provide the basics and were feeding children into vocational preparatory schools, to the final category of schools that were serving socially deteriorating communities where the major energies just went to maintaining some semblance of order. What Doll suggests is that the skills required of a teacher in these settings vary immensely. For instance, in the academically oriented traditional schools, mastery of content is of primary importance, while in the survival-oriented schools, maintaining tight supervision and control of the students is the most important teacher attribute. But given the separation of the training institutions, (universities and colleges) from public schools, the institutions settle by providing a generalized training that supposedly provides people with generic skills and knowledge that will be adaptable to many settings. Given the limitations touched on above, there is much doubt that most trainees can apply generalized training to concrete situations.

One reason why the first year of teaching is a special problem has to do with long term effects. In his poem, East Coker, T.S. Eliot wrote, "In my beginning is my end." While it is doubtful that Eliot was referring to teachers, there is a universality to his thought. One's initial impressions become what Argyris (1974) referred to as theories-in-use, conceptions that we use to interpret reality. In a series of studies recently done at the Ohio State University (Peterson, 1978; Newman, 1978; Burden, 1979) teachers at various stages in their career from five years of experience through retirement were extensively questioned about their careers, and how they developed. In all three studies an inordinate amount of time was spent by the teachers in reflecting on their initial years in the classroom. In effect, the first year stands out in a very clear way, and they see it as an important formative influence on what followed.

The first year of teaching, then, is a problem to beginning teachers, because teachers are forced to build on an inadequate base of training, because teachers have not been selected on the basis of skill at teaching, because they have general skills that they need help to apply to specific school situations, and finally, because the first year of teaching is so formative in their career development. Underlying all these is the view that the inadequate performance of first year teachers and negative long term effects of their initial year are unfair to the children.

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

To know that something is a problem, and, even, why it is a problem, is not to know how the problem is experienced by people. The question is what are some of the aspects of the first year that are troubling to beginning teachers? What are some of the things that they feel are causing them difficulties? Questions like this have been put to teachers fairly regularly. In 1951, Wey reported on his study of the problems of first year teachers. He reported the following as problem areas:

1. Handling problems of pupil control and discipline.
2. Adjusting to deficiencies in school equipment, physical conditions, and materials.
3. Adjusting to the teaching assignment.
4. Adapting to needs, interests, and abilities of pupils.
5. Motivating pupil interests and response.

In 1963, Dropkin and Taylor reported six areas of frequent problems for beginning teachers:

1. Discipline
2. Relations with parents
3. Methods of evaluating teaching
4. Planning
5. Materials and resources
6. Classroom routines.

A year later Broadbent and Cruickshank reported that teachers were troubled by the following problems:

1. Methods of teaching
2. Evaluation of students
3. Discipline
4. Parent relations
5. Classroom routines and materials
6. Personal problems (primarily a lack of self confidence).

More recently in 1978, two Stanford psychologists, Thomas J. Coats and Carl E. Thoresen summarized fifteen studies done over a fifteen-year period and reported that beginning teachers self-reported concerns and auxieties around the following five areas:

1. Their ability to maintain discipline in the classroom
2. Students' liking of them
3. Their knowledg of subject matter
4. What to do in the case they make mistakes or run out of material
5. How to relate personally to other faculty members, the school system and parents.

These last five categories (or problems) will be used to look more carefully at the experiences of beginning teachers. While one of the five, students liking of them, is not in itself a problem, it can be draining preoccupations and lead directly to problems. It also needs to be kept in mind that these five are simply five types of what can be a much longer, and certainly a much more detailed list.

Concern About Discipline. As far as we can tell teachers have always been concerned about discipline. In recent years, however, the teacher's status as disciplinarian has been weakened. For one thing teachers are no longer the authority figures they once were. Nor are they seen as people with a special knowledge. In an age when a large percentage of the population has gone to college, teachers don't seem to be particularly special. Also, we are in the midst of an era of relative permissiveness in our handling of children both in the family and in the school. These are a few of the reasons why discipline or classroom control has been given in creating attention in both inservice and preservice teacher training.

At the heart of the new teacher's anxiety about discipline is a series of uncertainties: What is the appropriate behavior that I should be establishing in my classroom: How do I establish it, and how do I keep it? How do I react to behavior that is outside those limits that seems clearly inappropriate? How do I deal with individuals who violate what I believe are reasonable standards?

While discipline is a common source of problems for first year teachers, it is not a universal problem. Some beginning teachers have social skills that seem to keep them free of classroom control difficulties. Some beginners are so loved by their students, that no one dares do anything to jeopardize his relationship with the teacher. Some teachers keep the students so busy and involved in their work, that there is no opportunity. Then there are special situations, like special scholarship sections or athletic teams where the high value of membership is enough to keep students under control. But while discipline problems are not universal, they are very widespread among beginning teachers. One possible contributing factor is that new teachers have had little opportunity managing other people. By this I mean, they have had little experience at telling people to do this, to go there, to stop and start that. Most beginning teachers don't know how to confront student misbehavior. If they do confront it, they often do it badly. Their early efforts to manage and to confront are often awkward, and reveal their uncertainty about the disciplinary aspects of teaching. Students sense this awkwardness and this inexperience, and due to boredom or malice or a combination of the two, they move against this perceived weakness.

New teachers are initially quite concerned about discipline. They are usually vigilant about transgressions during the first weeks of school. However, most students come to school each September with hopes that this year will be different, that this year they will do well, that this year they get a teacher that likes or understands them, and, as a result, most students are on their best behavior during those initial weeks. As the weeks go on the new teachers become lulled into false confidence about their capacities to maintain good behavior and students gradually move into a testing stage. For many these are painful and upsetting days where they are on the losing end of the struggle with students. These are followed typically by new student testing, new strategies, new resolve and better results. Many teachers, however, have a series of discipline

problems that plague the early and even middle months of their first year of teaching.

Being Liked by Students. All of us seek love and approval. These are clear human needs and often conditions for growth. Further, we need love and support at some times more than others. Institutions where we are personally confident, we do not have as great a need as at times of uncertainty when we are not on familiar ground. Simply looking at the conditions experienced by first year teachers, we could predict that it is a time of high need for approval. For instance, the new teacher is taking his initial plunge into the adult world of work and, in effect, trying on his chosen career. He is leaving behind the security of being a college student, and the familiarity of campus life and his friendship network. Often, the new teacher is in a strange community cut off from his family. He is a stranger to the school, its faculty and its administration. He is unfamiliar both with the school procedures and specifics of the content he is to teach. The reasons, then, for uncertainties and insecurities are evident.

During the initial weeks, the new teacher is also developing a number of questions: Am I succeeding? Is the instruction relevant? Am I really meeting the needs of my students? Are they as bored as their faces indicate? Am I as bad as I think I am, or am I just being hard on myself? One would hope that the new teacher would get answers to these questions from their supervisors, principals, or department chairperson. The fact is that they rarely do. In most schools beginning teachers are required to be visited somewhere between two and five times. The number of visits is usually kept to a minimum. Usually, the supervisor tells the beginning teacher when he is going to come in, stays for anywhere between fifteen minutes to an hour and holds a conference soon after. Although the principal's or chairperson's impressions are carefully weighed by the beginning teacher, he also knows that the principal has seen only two or three hours of the approximately one thousand hours of instruction the first year teacher spends in his class. On the other hand, the teacher realizes that his students are constant observers. The new teacher also receives a steady stream of reactions, verbal and non-verbal, from the students. Given the large number of these messages from the students and the paucity of indications of success or failure from other sources, it is no wonder that many teachers become preoccupied by what their students think about them. And, of course, there is the danger that inexperienced teachers will change their behavior simply to get more positive responses from students.

Teachers know, too, that the opinions of students, expressed to parents and other teachers will eventually get back to superiors, thus affecting their reputations and their possible chances of being rehired. It would appear that teachers have good reason to be concerned about their students liking them, but they need to be careful how to react to these student indications of liking or not liking.

Subject Matter. Knowledge of subject matter, or content, is the primary purpose of schooling. It is natural, then, that student achievement be an area of concern for the first year teachers. For one thing, they have had a very limited experience at teaching content. The experience of student teaching is only a light work-out in this regard. However, as first year teachers they must decide what to teach. (However much of this is taken care of in districts that have well-developed curricular guides.) They must also discover what their students know and do not know about the content, so they have a sense of where they should start. There are many related questions and concerns about planning and the sequencing of content but what they know and do not know about content is a major concern.

While secondary school teachers are often concerned with the depth of their knowledge, many elementary teachers have strong concerns, and subsequently problems, because they are not uniformly strong across the full content areas they must teach at a particular grade level. Typically, elementary school teachers feel much more competent with language and social studies than they do with science and mathematics.

Usually teachers have just come from the collegiate setting and contact with content specialists. Sitting in classes made most of them deeply aware of what they *do not* know about the content areas. Indeed, intellectual humility may be the major given of a college education. But while teachers may be initially concerned about how much they know of subject matter, the real problems are much more fundamental. For instance, they may not know thoroughly the core principles of their discipline. The English teacher may not know basic principles of language or writing. The social studies teacher may not know why people bond together to form societies. They may know information, but they may not know how to think about their subject field. And one major problem of subject matter is that the new teacher rarely knows how to connect it to life and, particularly, to the life of his or her students. The result is that those children with academic orientations will learn, but those with less interest do less well. Further, as a result of these lacks the first year teachers often live in fear of being asked tough content questions, and especially, "Why do we have to learn X or study Y? It just doesn't seem important to me!"

Mistakes and Material. Being on the other side of the desk is a jolting revelation for many first year teachers. Having had over fifty or sixty teachers for sixteen or more years of their own education, the new teachers think the teaching experience is one with which they are very familiar. Indeed, much of it is. However, they soon learn that being in command of a ship is very different from being a passenger. It is demanding enough to have to coordinate all of the human activity of a classroom, but being ready to deal with all the unanticipated aspects of teaching places special pressures on the teacher. He can plan forever, but still cannot protect himself from the unanticipated. There are two categories of unanticipated events facing the first year teacher: making teaching mistakes and running out of material.

There are all sorts of mistakes that can be made, some of which have been mentioned already, such as mistakes of content or discipline. Beginning teachers, however, make many mistakes about students: students from whom they expect a high level of performance surprise them by their limitations. Students for whom they have very low expectations, reach levels of achievement that were totally unpredicted. Also there is a whole range of methodological mistakes, such as, mistakes in making transitions from one part of a lesson to the other, or, in the case of the elementary school teacher, from one content area to another. Another arena for methodological mistakes is evaluation. The new teacher may grasp the principles of evaluation, but the nuts and bolts of how to record progress, how to weigh different activities, and develop appropriate standards for evaluation are mysteries. However, there are all the potential mistakes concerning school procedures. "What do I do when there is a fire drill?" "How do I record in the attendance record that Daryl went home sick during the middle of the morning?" "What do I do when I have lost the key to my classroom?" The first year teacher goes through the year as if he is walking on eggs and many of them are breaking.

A second category of unanticipated events is running out of material. The first time a teacher goes through a particular curriculum he is unaware of how much time it will take and how much material he will need. Will this lesson take three minutes or two hours? Will this unit be done in two days or two weeks? One of the essential aspects of being an experienced teacher is having a great deal of material at one's fingertips. The experienced teacher has had time to develop a number of different ways to reach certain instructional objectives. Quite often the beginning teacher finds out half-way through a lesson that he does not have enough material to reach his goals. He expected students to understand a particular concept taught in a certain way, and he finds that several are confused and need a totally different type of learning. He is stuck. Or the teacher has planned out the morning's activities and at 10:15 discovers that all the students have completed the assignment. An hour and a half until lunch and he can't think of anything to do! Or the other problem that one has planned to use a particular set of materials but as they approach the day that they are to be used, the new teacher realizes that they are totally inappropriate, and he has nothing to replace them.

Another material related problem is the demands made by the bright students, whether they be in kindergarten or advanced placement classes. Often these students chew up material and the new teacher is constantly running to catch up with their demands. Having intellectually curious and restless students can be very unsettling to the teacher.

Then, there is the most disheartening problem experienced by many beginning teachers when they finally have come up with what they believe is an exciting set of materials. They are eager to teach it, and when they finally begin to introduce the materials they are greeted with

a chorus of, "Ohhh! We did that last year in Mrs. Hollendecker's class!"

Other Teachers, Administrators, and Parents. The greatest surprises experienced by new teachers have to do with their relationships with the adults with whom they come in contact. We have anticipated the class control and content problems mentioned above. On the other hand, they almost universally expect to be welcomed into the adult world now that they are taxpayers and professionals. What they find, however, is a sense of isolation from many of the adults with whom they come in contact.

The three major groups of adults in lives of first year teachers are fellow teachers, administrators, and parents. Their relationship with each is complex and can only be sketched here. Perhaps, however, it is experienced teachers as a group who provide the beginner with the most surprises. They expected the school's experienced teachers to welcome them with warmth, if not open arms. And, indeed, experienced teachers usually do. Many experienced teachers welcome newcomers and indicate their availability for help, which is very encouraging. Then, unexpectedly, the experienced teachers seem to disappear, to step back. It is as if they retreated to the privacy of their classrooms and already established lunch groups. From these sanctuaries they appear to watch and see if the new teachers measure up, to see if they are "one of us." Will they make it? Perhaps there is a subtle sense that the newcomers may steal some of their status or upset the school's delicate balance or prestige. Perhaps they are aware that the newcomer is going through his rite of passage, just as they had to and they know the experience must be gone through alone. For whatever reason, the beginning teacher is isolated from a key source of professional and personal support.

The first year teacher's relationship with principals and other supervisory personnel is complex, but the reason is clearer than with teachers. The principal is in a classic role of conflict with his relationship with teachers. He is the official helper and the official evaluator or judge. The principal hires, assigns responsibilities to and is responsible for the performance of the new teacher. His job description indicates that he provide aid and instructional leadership. As such he is able to get resources, people and materials to the individual teacher. But, he must also evaluate performance. He must decide whether or not they will keep that new teacher. Is he the type of teacher I want to continue on my staff? If we rehire, what kind of assignment should be given to this teacher? And while this division between helper and evaluator can be separated out conceptually, in the daily flux and flow of life in schools, the teacher is never sure if he is dealing with the principal as helper or evaluator. This fact of wearing two hats would seem to inhibit both roles, helper and evaluator.

Parents, too, have their special surprises. Teachers often expect that parents will be their natural allies in the education of children. Many are. The new teacher discovers during the first parent night, however, that he meets the parents of the students who are not serious problems

or about whom the teacher has few serious concerns. The parents of students about whom the teacher has been anguishing are rarely there, however, and if they are there it results in further problems. The beginner discovers that the parents have very different perceptions of the child's difficulty or what is happening in school. The parents think that the new teacher is the source of the problem. The new teacher is "against" their child. These parent conflicts can be upsetting and disorienting. In a survey of a thousand teachers the author did a few years ago (Ryan, 1972) the teachers experienced and beginners, identified "dealing with parents" as an area that they felt prepared their teacher education. They chose "dealing with parents" from among twenty-five possibilities. Adults, then, are a source of serious anxiety for the beginning teacher. Later on they may develop easy relationships, but initially they have a tendency to trouble one another.

THE EFFECTS OF FIRST YEAR TEACHER PROBLEMS

We do not know in any systematic way what the effects of the problems experienced by first year teachers are on their future careers and on the students they teach. We have, however, some impressionistic data and some hints from the research. One instrument, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, that measures teachers' attitudes towards teaching as a profession and their students become more positive during training, including during student teaching. However, during the first four months of their initial year of teaching, their attitudes take a steep negative dive. That change in attitudes has been called "The Curve of Disenchantment" (Lagana, 1970). Later in the first year, attitudes begin to stabilize but they never get as high as they were during teacher training. Perhaps, teacher trainees' attitudes were unrealistic before they were confronted with the actual life of a classroom. But on the other hand, the trauma and disappointment of the first year may account for some of the distant and sour behavior students often experience from teachers. If students embarrass, defy, and make the teacher feel as if he had failed, it is easy to see why teachers withdraw from intimate and open contact with students.

There is an old canard about a teacher not having twenty years of experience, but having one year of experience twenty times. The point is that many teachers fail to grow and develop. They seize on one set of materials and one set of procedures and simply repeat that. Perhaps one reason that some teachers do not grow and develop can be found in the difficulty they had during their first year of teaching answering the question, "What works?" Their failures to find resources and materials may have caused them to seize on a few instructional options that gave them success and, thus, stopping their search and to some degree, their professional growth.

Many teachers are notorious for hoarding supplies, books and all sorts of instructional materials. Perhaps the root of this behavior can be

traced back to their difficulty in finding suitable materials, and their sense of isolation resulting from colleagues who are not forthcoming.

Given the kinds of difficulties experienced by first year teachers, one might think that people would flee from teaching during or immediately after their first year. While there is still a severe drop out rate in teaching (fluctuating from between six to ten percent per year), many people who had experienced severe problems stay in. Undoubtedly, the uncertain job market and shaky economy of the last several years has kept people from leaving teaching. In a study of eighteen first year teachers some colleagues at Ohio State and I recently completed, we found that all of the teachers were offered contracts for the following year and all but one accepted. As first year teachers they had worried a great deal about being rehired, but this was an empty worry. While some performed in an excellent fashion during their initial year, some were, in our judgment, quite inadequate. Still, again, all were offered jobs. Several teachers, though, had changed their attitude towards teaching during the year. What they had perceived as a vocation and an exciting occupation took on a slog-through-the-battlefields quality. For this group, the decision was to stay in teaching for a short term, until something better came along. One can only guess at the negative effects of this "short termer" attitude.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

The heart of this problem is that we put an undertrained individual in a complex and demanding environment with little or no supervision and few human or material supports. In this situation one could logically deduce that the psychologically strong individuals with well developed social skills will survive, whereas those who are uncertain and who lack interpersonal skills will fail. However, there is also a part of this that depends on the luck of the placement draw. Those fortunate enough to teach in a well-run school with orderly children, effective administration and a good colleague group will not experience the same degree of difficulty as those who are placed in schools with a high incidence of discipline problems, weak administrations and low teacher morale. But even in these less favorable settings, and even with teachers who are not paragons of confidence and social skill, the problems do not have to be as severe as they currently are. In fact, the problems of the first year teacher discussed in this essay and throughout this volume are, for the most part, solvable problems.

The fact that teachers are undertrained is a complicated and long-standing problem. Colleges and universities face severe structural and financial problems in attempting to improve teacher education. While much has been done in the recent past, this aspect of the problem is, nevertheless, beyond the scope of this paper. The solutions proposed in this final section of the paper are aimed at what happens on site once the teacher has had training and presents himself for a job.

The proposed solutions are grouped under three, somewhat overlap-

ping categories: conceptual changes, institutional activities, and human supports.

Conceptual Changes. The fundamental changes needed to solve this problem are conceptual changes. We have to begin, first, by realizing that it is a solvable problem, not something that is a necessary rite of passage into teaching. Historical roots and the fact that "everyone else has gone through it" is no excuse for letting the problem continue.

Second, we should conceive of entrance into teaching as a special stage in a person's personal and professional life and respond to it institutionally and humanly in an appropriate way. Recently, some of the educational community have begun to identify the early years as the induction phase. Even this labeling begins to focus our attention more clearly on the problem. People *need* to be *inducted*. Special things need to happen. It is not the same as other teaching experiences.

Third, we need new interpretive tools. The late Frances Fuller and her colleagues at the University of Texas have provided us with a very interesting start (Fuller, 1975). They have identified three stages of teacher development. The first stage, and the one that corresponds to the first year of teaching is called the survival stage. The new teachers' concerns are not with changing the lives of children or learning esoteric instructional skills, but simply surviving in the classroom. Getting through the day. Handling those disruptive students. Getting some content that *works!* Keeping the job! The second stage is called the stage of mastery. There the teacher's preoccupation is with acquiring the tools of the trade. They are busy about finding instructional skills, strategies and content that are effective. Again, the preoccupation is with self, but it is more related to the fundamental job of teaching. The third stage is a stage of impact in which teacher's concern finally focuses on whether or not he is having a positive impact on students and what it is that individual students need from the instructional situation. The Fuller work provides us a model to think about the plight of the first year teacher. If the new teacher's psychic energies are devoted to survival, that is where our attention and resources should also be focused.

Fourth, we should not expect the new teacher to be able to do everything. Rather, we should find out what he can do well, and have him do that. If we play to his professional strengths, there is a greater likelihood that he will succeed. Success in one level of activities will free them to move into other areas and experience success there. What this suggests is that instead of a catch-all, sink or swim experience, the first year of teaching should be a carefully sequenced set of experiences building on a model of success. Admittedly, this type of success curriculum for the first year teacher is much easier to suggest than to implement.

Instructional Activities. There are a number of things that institutions can do to ease the plight and maximize the potential growth of first year teachers. Earlier, I commented that the possible changes in teacher education are beyond the scope of this essay. Nevertheless, there are at

least two things that universities could do to ease the burden of the first year teacher. The first, would be to provide an opportunity for people who are finished with teacher training and are awaiting their first job to study what is known about being a first year teacher. My colleague, John Johnston of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, with whom I have studied the problems of beginning teachers for a number of years, has this year instituted a course for people prior to going into their first year of teaching. The aim of Johnston's course is to confront these soon-to-be teachers with the reports of other teachers on their difficulties in their initial year and to help them plan strategies to cope with what Fuller calls the survival stage. Also, once the teacher has a job in a particular school, they can begin, particularly in the context of a course such as this, to plan practical activities that will mitigate some of the problems. A second, and more general activity, would be for university schools and colleges of education to combine with the schools in their area to provide special support for beginning teachers. Besides the possible positive impact on the first year teachers, the opportunity for university teacher trainers to work in schools with the kinds of problems experienced by first year teachers, might help them to make preservice training more relevant to the needs of beginning teachers.

A third institutional activity is for the school system to make a serious effort at providing orientation to the new teachers entering the system. In order to keep teachers from experiencing the kind of overload dramatized in *Up the Down Staircase*, the school system should get information to the teachers prior to the time they will need it. As soon as teachers are hired, they should be sent copies of the curricula they will be teaching, along with materials describing district procedures and policies. There should, however, be a clear period set aside before school begins designated as orientation. Stressing again, the survival needs, they should be told what they need in order to insure success in that particular setting. This can mean finding out such things as who one gets the ditto paper from, and how one goes about organizing a field trip. Key people in the lives of first year teachers should be brought in one at a time for information exchanges and discussions. The temptation of administrators to give rousing talks on "the challenges of today's youth" and other such generalized presentations should be suppressed. At that point it is more important that the beginning teacher know how to get around the building and how exactly to use their gradebooks.

Fourth, the new teacher needs a special inservice program, which should have two aspects. The first would be, in effect, a continuation of the special orientation. Only so much can be absorbed during that preschool orientation. This on-going orientation should be built around the common problems experienced by first year teachers in that particular setting. If discipline is what has caused most teachers problems in the past, that should be a major agenda item for these special inservice meetings. A few weeks before the new teachers scheduled first meeting with parents, attention should be given to that complex phenomenon. As grading approaches, the new teacher should be given special help here.

The second aspect of this inservice should be individualized. Even if all the beginning teachers in the building have the same problems, they undoubtedly will have them at different times during the year. Therefore, people and time should be set aside to help the individual new teachers with their unique concerns. While this aspect may be the easiest to ignore, it may, in fact, be the most important.

A fifth activity is reducing the teaching load and making sure that beginning teachers do not get mired down with difficult extracurricular activities. This is a common suggestion of easing the burden of the first year teacher, but rarely done. Currently some English school districts are experimenting with improved induction plans and the reduction of load is among the most popular solutions among beginning and experienced teachers (Bolam, 1973). While this is undoubtedly a helpful solution, in that it provides the new teacher with more time to plan and fewer instructional problems, it is also the most expensive of the alternatives suggested. To relieve a secondary school teacher of one period costs the school district approximately $2000. For elementary school teachers the problem becomes more difficult in that the school authorities would have to hire a special teacher for part of the day. Or, if the classes were reduced dramatically in size, that would also mean a heavy expense for the school. While this is an attractive alternative, if it were a matter of reducing load or spending those resources on some of these other alternatives, I would suggest the latter.

Human Supports. Human support systems, or more directly, people who can help, are essential to any solution. The beginning teacher is isolated from experienced adults. He needs their know-how. He needs their advice. He needs the human contact and encouragement they can provide. It is the very nature of schooling, however, that individual teachers spend the bulk of their day in isolation from other adults working with groups of children. We need, therefore, to structurally rearrange things so that new teachers have more contacts with older teachers.

One possible way of breaking into this isolated situation, would be to appoint a buddy teacher to work with the beginner. Many school systems do this. However, few support it enough to make it fully operational. These buddy teachers should be chosen because they have the personal and professional capacities to be a positive influence on beginners. Further, it should not be something that is laid on an already full schedule of activities and obligations. If we are serious about providing help to the teacher, we should make this a legitimate extracurricular activity or provide some special remuneration for it. In a society devoted to free enterprise, one possible way would be to have the beginning teacher buy the services of an experienced teacher. In effect, a fund would be set aside for this which the beginning teacher would use, selecting the individual whom *he felt* was most compatible and able to provide him with what he needed. Clearly, though, some mechanism must be developed to provide the beginning teacher with better access

to his experienced colleagues than provided by a casual cup of coffee in the teachers lounge.

A second solution is some form of team teaching. The only real justification for team teaching is whether or not it makes a positive difference in the instruction of children. However, it holds the potential of providing an excellent introduction to teaching for a beginner. A related approach is the house plan where a number of teachers are responsible for the total curriculum for a large group of students. For example, four teachers with differing subject specialties would be responsible for the basic curriculum for one hundred students. In research on first year teachers, mentioned above, I followed the progress of a new seventh grade math teacher who was part of a house plan team (Ryan, 1978). The opportunity to meet daily with a team of experienced teachers and discuss the upcoming day's work, particular learning problems of students, different teaching strategies and an array of other issues appeared to be immensely beneficial. Also, it broke the social isolation and, in effect, gave the new teacher a friendship network.

A third solution is to provide special counseling for the first year teacher. As indicated above there are special emotional strains on the beginning teacher. Uncertainties, self doubts, strong emotions, like hatred, are brought to the surface during the first year. Many beginning teachers would be well served if they had someone with counseling skills available for help. While talking to one's spouse, to one's colleague and administrator/supervisor may have certain benefits, they all, too, have limitations. The opportunity in a safe setting to special benefits. In the Ohio State First Year Teachers Study referred to above, the seven researchers conducted five indepth interviews with the first year teachers beginning before they began teaching, during the year and at the very end of teaching. We were quite worried about the time we were taking in the lives of these first year teachers and were worried that some would find the experience annoying or troubling. Quite the contrary! We sent them questionnaires in December and March probing their attitudes about being involved in our research. We also promised that we would not look at the results for a full year. To our amazement, every new teacher responded to both interviews and *all* had positive attitudes toward the process. From this and other research we are convinced that simply having someone to talk to about teaching is satisfying and, to some degree, therapeutic.

CONCLUSION

If the first year of teaching is a problem and if it is a solvable problem—two assumptions of this paper—why does the problem persist? Two sources of solution are the public, who pays for public instruction, and the profession. First, the public. While many people are aware of the special difficulties faced by first year teachers, the primary concern of the lay public is with instruction provided for children. To the degree that they are aware of the induction problem, it is an isolated, varied and

individual one. Even those efforts to dramatize the problem to the public, such as *Up the Down Staircase*, end on the traditional upnote, leaving the impression that the first year of teaching has a happy ending. Therefore, while the public may be led to support solutions, we should not look to the public to initiate solutions.

Why the profession, teachers and administrators, have not done more to solve the problem is difficult to answer. Again, we can only speculate. One reason, is that people blessedly forget pain. Once having gone through the experience, we repress the suffering. Second, as mentioned above, people who have been through initiation rites, like to cling to them. No one loves boot camp like someone who went through it three or four years ago. Another possible reason is that teaching is a maturing profession and teachers have simply not come around to this problem yet. Recently, teachers have been busy politically organizing the profession, dealing with collective bargaining and issues of wages and benefits. Perhaps, now is the time to look at the induction phase of teaching. Certainly, if teachers are looking for a clear issue and a solvable, problem, they have one at the threshold of the profession.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C., and D.A. Schon. *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

Bolam, R. *Induction Programmes for Probationary Teachers*. The University of Bristol, 1973.

Broadbent, F, and D. Cruickshank. "The Identity and Analysis of Problems of the First Year Teacher," (October, 1965 ERIC Ed. 013-786 FP 001-282).

Burden, Paul. Teachers' Perceptions of the Characteristics and Influences on Their Personal and Professional Development (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, in progress, The Ohio State University, 1979).

Coates, T., and Thoressen, C. "Teacher Anxiety: A review with Recommendations." *Review of Educational Research*, Spring, 1978, pp. 159-184.

Doll, Russell. "Defining and limits of educational innovation and change" in (Barry L. Klein, Janet T. Collier, Olga S. Jerrett, and Donna K. Ulrici, eds.) *Innovative Practices in Teacher Education: Preservice Through Inservice*, Georgia State University: Atlanta, Georgia, 1977.

Dropkin, S. and Taylor, M. "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers and Related Factors." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1963, pp. 384-390.

Fuller, F. and Bonno. "Becoming a Teacher," in K. Ryan (ed.) *Teacher Education: The sixty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (Part II) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Ligana, J. *What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers*. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Lortie, D.C. *School-teacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, pp. 60-61.

Newman, Katherine. Middle-Aged Experienced Teachers' Perceptions of Their Career Development (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1978).

Peterson, Anne. Career Patterns for Secondary School Teachers: An Exploratory Interview Study of Retired Teachers (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1978).

Request for Proposals (RR-NIE-R-78-0014). The Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C., 1948.

Ryan, K., P. Kleine, R. Krasno. Realities or Revolution. Report No. 6 of the Commission on Public School Personnel Policy in Ohio, Cleveland, Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation, 1972.

Ryan, K., K. Newman, G. Mager, J. Applegate, T. Lasley, R. Flora and J. Johnston. *Biting the Apple: Accounts of First Year Teachers*, Longman, Inc: New York, 1978 (In press).

Tisher, R.P. "Teacher induction: An aspect of the education in professional development of teachers." Paper presented at the Conference on Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, the University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1979. (Mimeograph)

Young, Joseph. *Personal Communication*. The National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., 1978.

Wey, H.W. "Difficulties of Beginning Teachers," *School Review*, 1951, pp. 32-57.

SOME ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAMS TO SUPPORT TEACHERS IN THE BEGINNING YEARS

Carol Lewis

THE NEEDS OF THE BEGINNING TEACHER

> Don't you think our attitudes and feelings come from the children? I know that some days they respond to me and I feel on top of the world. And maybe the next day, I'll ask them the same thing and they won't give me an answer. That exhausts me. But I get tired from being on top of the world, too. I go home after a day of just fantastic teaching, where it worked, really worked, and I could just fall apart. I'm so tired from being that high. The role is exhausting, any way you play it.
>
> I want to build a math course with a whole new concept. The hangup is, why wasn't I properly trained for teaching? Why did I have to discover so much on the job? Have I messed up kids because I couldn't recognize those things I should have been able to see—nutritional factors, family and emotional factors? How do I convey knowledge to a child so that he can understand it, and can get a good feeling about himself? So he can have a success to build on? I don't have the training to do it. I go home with these things troubling me.
>
> We all want to be good teachers. And we're all nervous and we all have our share of hangups. We've found out the hard way that we're untaught to teach and most certainly not prepared to mold. That was hard for me to face. Now that I know it, what happens? Do I run? Or hang in there and try to learn how to teach? (Bower, 1973, pp. 34-35).

These are the words of three beginning teachers, sharing with one another their experiences and feelings about the first year of teaching. They typify the frustrations, loneliness and difficulties many of us knew as we entered the profession. The teachers interviewed in the preceding chapter express similar concerns and frustrations. These initial feelings and experiences greatly affected our ability to achieve success, they affected the way we perceived ourselves, and the extent to which we were able or willing to continue in work for which we had spent four years or more of undergraduate study preparing.

Teaching is difficult. Learning is complex. The beginning teacher is both teacher and learner. This phase of teacher education needs more of our attention, and a great deal of thoughtful discussion. It is a critical but often overlooked phase in the teacher education continuum.

In 1946 the ACE Council on Teacher Education wrote these words:

> . . . The improvement of teacher education is a critical national necessity, for (on teacher quality) depends the quality of instruction offered in the schools...and that quality is largely determined by the excellence of the arrangements for the education of teachers. Such arrangements are not at present satisfactory. . . . (Stone 1968, p. 153).

Thirty-three years later those arrangements—particularly for induction (I will use this term to refer to the critical initial years of teaching) into the profession—are still not satisfactory. This paper will highlight some concerns relative to induction, suggest some possibilities for strengthening support for induction programs, and identify a number of related issues.

There is no lack of information which tells us that teachers are dissatisfied with what happens in induction. Surveys, conferences, and publications spotlight again and again their concerns about inadequate preparation in preservice programs, and the lack of support in the initial years of teaching. Yet there appear to be only isolated instances of local school districts and/or institutions of higher education addressing these concerns. No comprehensive approach—no overarching set of guidelines—seems to exist which might be of benefit to the many role groups and decision-makers with the potential to bring about changes in preparation and induction programs.

Some systematic effort to address these problems is evolving at the Federal level as Joe Vaughn outlines in his paper. The National Institute of Education has recently funded a study which will more systematically gather information that may, in time, enable us to begin making such decisions. The study will seek to identify the answers to such questions as:

> What are the problems of beginning teachers and interns? What solutions have been proposed for these problems...? What are the critical components of internships; that is, what aspects of programs have demonstrated effectiveness for producing greater teaching effectiveness and ability to cope with the problems of teaching in particular schools or programs? What problems arise in the development and operation of internship programs? What theoretical models of internship programs are described in the literature, and what are the models now being used in practice? How different are they? And why? What aspects of the internship program have been evaluated, and what is the demonstrated effectiveness of internship programs? (ETS, 1978).

Educational Testing Service which was awarded the NIE proposal has identified four areas of potential problems for beginning teachers: learning the school as a social system; learning about the school as an instructional system; learning about the pupil population; and learning to instruct. The new teacher in attempting to make the transition from student to professional undergoes dramatic and demanding changes and must rapidly acquire knowledge and skills in all four of these areas. In addition, there is the continuing need to come to grips with one's own identity as a teacher. This listing of five areas of learning

for the beginning teacher is not intended to be comprehensive, but only to underscore the great diversity of needs which seem at times to inundate the new teacher, and for which support systems are needed. Let's briefly look at these basic needs.

Understanding oneself: "Teachers must do more than look at themselves. They need professional competencies which they do not presently possess in order to describe their behavior and some frameworks against which to evaluate their behavior in a scholarly manner...As teachers become aware of areas in which they would like to change, they need help in knowing how to accomplish the change."(Hartman, 1978, p. 12).

We must not underestimate the tremendous mental and emotional energy consumed in the process of coming to terms with one's own "teacher identity" and the need for ways to understand and articulate what that means to each individual. The three new teachers who are quoted at the outset of this paper were part of a discussion group which provided them with a "safe" environment for that kind of analysis and self-understanding.

Learning about the school and the pupils: This area of learning is also very complex, and requires knowledge and understanding of the particular school and community to which the new teacher is assigned, the norms and values of that setting, administrative policy, interaction with parents, awareness of the role of teacher organizations, procedures for staff interaction, and a variety of other issues related to the school as a social setting within a larger social setting. Some educators are questioning how much teacher preparation should occur away from institutions of higher education, in school sites. Others advocate the uniqueness of communities and the diversity of skill and knowledge requirements in different school settings which demand training specific to those contexts. They would greatly complement the "generalist" preparation with situation-specific training. They are looking for the development of teacher training programs which more adequately reflect both school building and school district environments (The Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1976).

Learning to instruct: Many areas of professional competence become meaningful and significant only when viewed from the perspective of actual teaching situations. Beginning teachers often stress the need for earlier and more extensive "field based experiences" in preservice preparation programs. They urge an end to the artificial separation of "content" and "methods." In an interview with a number of first-year teachers, these comments came out:

> Students should take content and methods courses simultaneously and apply them in a local school setting the same semester.
>
> I think students should take the teaching of math, science, reading, social studies, and art and then be given the opportunity to use these courses right away in a local school. Otherwise they'll forget them.

You just can't take a content or methods course as a sophomore and say you'll remember the materials and ideas when student teaching as a senior. It just doesn't work because you forget too easily.

The time lag is too great. You should use the content material and methods immediately in a local school setting (DeBruin, 1978, p. 21).

A BASIC PROBLEM

Walter Doyle, in discussing the importance of learning within the context in which one will teach phrased it this way:

> In the final analysis, classroom knowledge can only be gained by experience as a teacher in the classroom environment. Research is needed, therefore, on the complex processes of learning to be a teacher in the classroom. My own experience in studying induction suggests that the feedback beginning teachers receive is very important in helping them acquire classroom knowledge. Such feedback needs to be keyed to the demands of the classroom environment. That is, feedback must be based on classroom knowledge. In addition, there is a clear possibility of developmental processes involved in learning to be a teacher (Doyle, 1979, p. 15).

A stronger relationship between the "real life" experience in both student teaching and the initial years of induction in the profession, and both theoretical and methods work would make it easier for the teacher-student to draw meaningful relationships and see the significance of specific information and skills to specific teaching responsibilities. It might also be a means to improve the teacher-student's ability to critique and analyze teaching experiences and situations (Coyne, 1970).

A survey of teacher education graduates which sought to pinpoint those areas of college experience which the graduate felt were most helpful in acquiring skills for classroom teaching stressed the importance of field-based experiences and relationships with other students (Morris and Ussery, 1973).

The fragmentation of teacher preparation programs, and the graduates' sense of a lack of relationship between preservice coursework and their needs in the classroom as beginning teachers, merits attention from *both* higher education institutions and school district personnel to identify theory/practice linkages and adjust program offerings where needed.

> Current teacher training curriculum is composed of numerous unrelated courses, forcing the student 'to make connections or bridges himself, and when that happens, the relationships are often made incorrectly or not at all.' Under these conditions, it often becomes the responsibility of education departments to bridge the content of these various courses. A continuation of contact between the new teacher and the preparing institution, in instances when that is practical and feasible, would assist in the "bridging process" (Pruitt and Lee, 1978, p. 70).

A pilot study conducted in New York state sought information on induction problems and practices encountered by beginning teachers. A number of building principals were also interviewed to determine what

formal or informal programs existed in the schools to facilitate the induction of first year teachers into the profession. The conclusions of that study were quite predictable: the first year teachers were generally dissatisfied with the relevance of their preservice training and with their schools' induction programs. They had encountered many problems and difficulties in their first teaching experiences. Principals recognized the need for better induction programs, but time and resources restricted progress in this area. Planned programs rarely consisted of more than a day or two of orientation to the district and community. Ongoing instructional assistance was not provided during this induction phase.

TOWARD REMEDIATION OF THE PROBLEM

Although there is very little in the way of existing programs, there is a great deal of commonality about "what might be." The literature on induction—when it goes beyond description of the *problems* of the beginning teacher—commonly identifies the need for support systems for beginning teachers which have these characteristics:

a. New teachers are given a *reduced workload* during the first year of entry into the profession.
b. New teachers are given *time* to continue their studies in relationship to their work; this study includes an analysis of what is happening in their classrooms. While this time for study and analysis may take the form of structured seminars, there is some research which suggests that released time—unstructured and unsupervised—can be of real benefit and is used well. This may suggest that the more complicated (and expensive) support systems we have been considering may not be necessary (Bradley and Eggleston, 1972).
c. New teachers are given time to and assisted in better understanding their new relationships with other staff and with the community and are able to observe other teachers working.
d. Opportunities for *peer discussions* among new teachers are provided in an atmosphere that encourages openness and problem/feeling sharing.
e. A *mentor* is available and willing to work with each new teacher. Preferably this is someone who works with the same grade level of students or in the same curriculum area. It may be a cooperating teacher from the same district, or a university staff person designated to provide assistance. *The support of this fellow teacher must not be related to evaluation of the novice teacher.*

THE ROLE OF THE MENTOR

The relationship of the beginning teacher and the more experienced teacher who may become a mentor/advisor merits special attention. Virtually all discussion of improved induction addresses the need to strengthen these relationships and to formalize them in some way. A frequently cited problem in teacher preparation is the lack of a process

for transferring knowledge and skills about classroom interaction from one professional to another, and the resulting need for each new teacher to acquire such information and knowledge from his or her own direct classroom experience. "Reliance on this method is often costly for beginning teachers, pupils, and teacher education (Doyle, 1979, p. 13)."

> Other professions and crafts give their practitioners whole arrays of techniques, instruments, tools, devices, formulas, strategies, tactics, algorithms, and tricks of the trade. Engineering, medicine, law, and journalism, to name just a few, have all of these kinds of aids that make the job possible for ordinary mortals. The engineer has his slide rule, transit, and handbook of stress tables; the physician, his plethysmograph, sphygmomanometer, and pharmacopoeia; the lawyer, his codes, classified collections of precedents, and interrogation skills; the journalist, his formulas for writing leads and his standard rules of content and style. But in teaching, we find relatively few of these ways of making complex tasks more manageable. Teachers are expected to rediscover for themselves the formulas that experienced and ingenious teachers have acquired over the years. Each generation of teachers benefits too little from the inventions of its predecessors. Too little of the wisdom of the profession gets saved and passed along for the benefit of the novice. What teaching needs—if it is to be improved in the hands of ordinary persons, who are not geniuses or inspired artists, and if it is to be improved with resources at a level not inconceivably high—is a much more abundant and helpful supply of "tools of the trade" (Gage, 1972, p. 195).

Dan Lortie expressed the same concern in this way:

> . . . although hundreds of thousands of teachers have worked in schools and in the course of that work have learned much about teaching, the vast proportion of their learning is not available to beginners today. No regular arrangements have been developed to catch and record the many solutions which they have created to solve problems— solutions which, were they available, might prove useful to succeeding generations of beginners. Something of what teachers have learned is passed on informally and verbally where a kind senior will help a favored youngster, but no carefully worked out arrangements exist for the systematic recording of teacher practices and outcomes (Lortie, 1965, p. 62).

Induction or internship programs which build in a "cooperating teacher," "teacher mentor," or "teacher-tutor," by whatever name would appear to be one approach to improving the transfer of experiences and skills from veteran professional to novice.

Although there is much agreement on the importance of this inductive phase of teacher preparation, it also presents a major complication to existing economic, legal and political arrangements. These range beyond the programmatic and fiscal questions of funding and released time for both the noviate and the mentor. The recommendations of the New York state Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification discussed the importance of care in selection of the teacher-mentor, the daily responsibility of the mentor for assistance to the intern, and the need for a nonevaluative, nonthreatening mentor

role. The Task Force recommended a selection process involving the teachers' bargaining agent. Mentors would have to have demonstrated human relations skills, excellence in teaching, and a wish to participate in the program. The "matching" of disciplines of the mentor and the intern was also suggested.

The Wisconsin Improvement Program outlines a very demanding series of responsibilities for the mentor, including communicating to the intern the mores and expectations of the community; acquainting the intern with professional ethics; and helping the intern to become self-directed and self-analytical. The implications not only for mentor selection, but for ongoing training for mentor-teachers if they are to be effective are challenging.

Janet Newberry's (1977) study of influences on beginning teachers adds further complications. She found that experienced teachers strongly influenced beginners—particularly in terms of expectations for student achievement. However, new teachers were very hesitant to seek such help because of concerns about raising the question of their own competence. Experienced teachers were often hesitant to offer help or to get involved with novice teachers, sometimes for fear of seeming to interfere. The beginning teachers Newberry studied were also very selective and discriminatory in terms of which other school staff they perceived as of potential assistance to them. They relied most exclusively for advice from teachers at the same grade level or working in the same curriculum area, whose "teaching ideologies" seemed compatible with their understanding of their own, and who "taught the way they wanted to." This research suggests the need for thoughtful pairing of mentor with beginning teachers, and considerations that go beyond human relations and communications skills in mentor selection. One might raise the question, for example, of just how much consonance is appropriate and how much humane probing into new insights is needed.

We can cautiously suggest that these four elements should be considered in induction programs: reduced workload; time for study, peer discussions, and mentoring. Various ways of achieving these goals should be studied as we discuss and plan for improved approaches to induction. At the same time there is the necessity to remind ourselves that "generalized prescriptions of how to support teachers in their first years are of limited use (Newberry, p. 10)."

INTERNSHIPS: SOME PROBLEMS

These four ingredients have suggested to some that an internship program might be one way to improve programs of teacher preparation and induction. As Howey and Bents have pointed out earlier, a number of universities and several state education agencies have piloted such programs over the years. None presently exists on a large scale across states—for reasons that are often very similar.

Most intern programs are costly, requiring funding for the new teacher (though it may be on partial salary) as well as for the mentor/

support teacher who works with the intern(s). Adequate funding to assure interns a "living wage" is important if programs are to attract quality applicants.

In recent years, with the growing strength of teacher organizations and the reduced demand for new teachers, questions of internships were caught up in political issues related to control and entry to the profession. Related issues had to do with the status of the intern teacher within the profession, and teacher organization concerns relative to reduced pay scales for interns.

In some states these are questions of practicality. The administrative complications—in organizing an internship program, the adequacy of supervision of interns by cooperating local school districts and schools and colleges of education, and worries about possibly excluding students and even institutions since it might be difficult to place all graduates in an internship, or the involvement of institutions of higher education without graduate programs might be limited—all these factors and more affected the degree of interest and support for such programs. If satisfactory completion of an internship were required for certification, placement problems which closed out some preservice graduates would be a major concern. Certainly implications for changes in teacher certification have always arisen when an internship was under consideration, and the ramifications of such action for experienced teachers were often raised. A lack of evidence that internship programs can have long-term impact upon participants has also raised questions, as some research suggests an increase in job satisfaction with internship programs, but no evidence of increased effectiveness.

It is not surprising then that a number of states have considered but put aside plans for internships. However, continuing re-examination of such programs or components of such programs can be anticipated. There is still a widespread concern to develop a better transition between preservice activities and the initial years of teaching and a desire to provide improved support for this induction phase of teacher education. This implies some kinds of extended training programs and mentoring possible with an internship. The New York Task Force provided this rationale:

> The first year of teaching practice, which should and could be a dramatic and rewarding experience, is more often than not a traumatic and frustrating one. The all-too vivid memory of that first year of teaching accounts, perhaps, for the almost universal approval for the beginning teacher. Often beginning teachers are given large classloads, are assigned to classes composed of more difficult members of the student body, and are not given time to observe various teaching methods and styles employed in classrooms other than their own or to seek on-the-job assistance from more experienced colleagues. Most importantly, there is no individual mentor to whom they can feel absolutely free to turn to for nonthreatening, nonevaluative guidance. (For many beginning teachers, unsure of themselves in a new experience, seeking help from a supervisor implies a tacit admission of "incompetence.") Under such circumstances, it is not difficult to understand why most educators recall their first year of teaching with something

less than enthusiasm. Success, it seemed, was not a matter of professional growth and instructional achievement, but a matter of overcoming obstacles usually found in the first year of teaching.

The goal of the internship program recommended in this report is to remove present obstacles to a successful first-year teaching experience and to provide positive support toward professional growth in that crucial period. The Task Force believes such a program to be an essential component of a successful teacher preparation program. Coordinated with and based upon previous training, it can be an invaluable extension of that portion of preservice training acclaimed by teachers as one of their most valuable experiences—the supervised student teaching that helped them begin the task of applying knowledge, skills, and theory to actual practice (p. 3).

THE POSSIBLE ROLE OF TEACHER CENTERS AND STATES

Current and future discussion of induction period support systems may increasingly revolve around a new component—the teacher center. Many states are moving in this direction with either state or federally funded centers. The teacher center's focus upon teacher initiated, identified, and delivered assistance to other teachers appears to be a variation on the mentoring, sharing theme.

In Florida, the state legislature has funded a study to be conducted by the state education agency and higher education institutions. That study will examine approaches to teacher preparation, and will look at a fifth year internship as one possibility. There has been both a great deal of positive interest and considerable controversy about such an internship. Potential directions in Florida include looking for ways to tie the beginning years of teaching more closely to preservice work; changing certification requirements for all teachers in the state to emphasize continuing education throughout the professional carreer; identifying performance crieria against which a teacher's work could be measured; and, finally, looking for strategies with the potential to influence change not only in individuals, but also in institutions of higher education and school buildings. It is anticipated that new designs in Florida will include linkage to the statewide system of teacher education centers, and an increase in funds for colleges to work through the centers to meet the concerns of beginning teachers.

Georgia is now in the midst of a new program which has been in the planning and preparation stages since 1973. The plan is based on the belief that the best help for a beginning teacher is ongoing assistance from an experienced teacher, and that preservice preparation must be extended into the early years of employment. Generic competencies have been identified, and in the fall of 1979 beginning teachers will be observed and evaluated in their classrooms on these skills. A statewide network of regional assistance centers has been funded by the state legislature to assist teachers in this new scheme.

In Michigan professional development advisory councils conduct

needs assessments of area educators and use that information for local, regional and statewide planning for inservice activities. There are implications for programs of both preservice and inservice as the second year data continue to identify three major areas of concern: student self-concept; classroom management; and individualizing instruction.

In each of these states, efforts are underway to provide teachers with the time and skills to analyze themselves, their work, and their settings in identifying problem areas. The next major step, looking at human, dollar, and material resources which might address those needs, is being confronted.

Thus it seems, in many instances, the quality of life and work for the beginning teacher has suffered because of the lack of two essential components for continuing growth. First, there have been moderate opportunities for analysis and feedback. Did the lesson go well? Why or why not? "Classrooms are crowded with people, activities and interruptions; many events take place at the same time; and there is little time available for a teacher to reflect before acting or even to anticipate the direction of events" (Doyle 1979, p. 12). Second, there has been inadequate help in addressing a need once it has been identified.

In Britain a new support system for beginning teachers is underway. The first year of teaching is referred to as probationary. The government provides support not only for teacher-tutors (mentors) but also for reduced workloads for the new teachers. Teacher centers—professional centres—play an active role in the transition from the life of a student to the life of a professional (Julius, 1976).

THE NEED FOR COOPERATIVE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Eugene Schipmann, a classroom teacher speaking almost 15 years ago at the 1965 national TEPS conference, asked: "Why do we still have the problems we had ten years ago for the beginning teacher?" He answered himself by stating that "One reason may be that although problems are easily identified, they are difficult to solve. We often are quick to blame others for the problems and look to others for solutions . . " (Schipmann, 1965, p. 69).

There are lots of "others" to blame, and the multiple layers of decision-makers who are involved in determining the nature of induction programs and the kinds of support which will be available to the beginning teacher make program improvement very difficult. "Who is ready to do something about the problems, frustrations, fears and needs of the new teacher? *Whose responsibility is the new teacher?*" (Lortie, 1965, p. ix).

State legislatures, state boards of education, state education agency program approval and certification offices, schools and colleges of education, local boards of education, district administrators, building principals, classroom teachers, and teacher organizations—all play a role in formal and informal systems which could make a difference in the

improvement of the induction process. Even the possibility of bringing together such groups for dialogue on ways to bring about change seems an overwhelming task. Yet our potential strength lies in exactly that kind of collaboration. Schipmann (1965) went on to say:

> We have not openly faced differences of opinion that exist among classroom teachers, administrators, and college educators. Much of how we look at things depends upon our background. Much of how we interpret what we see is based upon our position in the education profession, be it classroom teacher, administrator, or college professor. There are and should be differences of opinion, and from these, from the sincere intelligent thinking of committed educators, comes the educational progress we all desire (p. 67-68).

We need to set aside the time to explore together the purposes and processes of school experiences, and better define the teacher's role in the school. That kind of cooperation and collaboration takes time, and a commitment to rethinking and redesigning resources to focus the learning of the new teacher in ways that are meaningful. Clarification of the various roles to be played by various parties is an essential part of that dialogue. Drummond (1973) discussed the role of state departments of education in teacher education, urged that state education agencies take the initiative in promoting change, and emphasized the need for SEA's themselves to change in a number of ways. This included the prioritization of funds, the development of statewide information systems, assuming greater leadership in the establishment of policy, and finally the bringing together of the various interest groups.

NEED FOR PROTOTYPES

Perhaps the best that we can work toward in attempting to have an impact on the very massive and complex business of teacher preparation will be what Edward Ladd (1965) calls "islands of change." Often the best way to improve all schools is to start with one school or one teacher preparation program and make it into what has been called an "island of change" . . . It is easier for a small group of concerned people to build one island of change than it is to improve the whole picture, and setbacks are less discouraging" (p. 82). School-focused programs of support for induction may well be more possible in some districts than others and might help to bring about community, parental, and school/staff involvement and investment in success for new teachers in ways that strengthen the total school/community climate (Ryan, 1974).

In summary, experimental programs in teacher education suggest the need to develop preparation/induction support systems with such characteristics as these: a) joint program planning by college of education staff, representatives of academic departments in the university and public school teachers and administrators; b) responsibility for teacher education and teacher induction shared by the university with the school and community; c) initial teaching experiences acquired as a member of a teaching team, rather than as a lone individual (Stone, 1968); d) new

teachers placed into groups established as positive, nonthreatening environments for support and problem sharing; and e) ongoing seminars related to initial teaching experiences and new teachers' perceived areas of concern (Olson, 1971).

Few such programs exist. Their creation in the complex configurations which currently exist for decision-making for teacher preparation and induction present a major challenge that requires of us thinking and planning that can project ideas and ways of working from the "eagle's eye view." We are called upon to stretch our thoughts in ways in which we have often had little practice. We are called upon to learn and practice new skills in collaboration with all the various parties and role groups with a stake in teacher education. We are compelled to recognize and begin to address the gaps in our own knowledge and understanding of human learning and training of adult.

Dr. Thomas F. Ryan (1979) of Western Michigan University, in testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, expressed it this way:

> . . . teacher education in its broadest sense is a shared responsibility in which the college of education may play a leadership role, but in which many other individuals, agencies and organizations also have a vital role to play . . . What we must learn . . . is that the commitment of an individual to the profession must be met with an equal commitment from us—the people who are the profession—to support their efforts . . . As a matter of policy, efforts to establish new coalitions between practitioners, their professional organizations, institutions of higher education, state education agencies, and other appropriate stakeholders (should) be encouraged in order to reconceptualize the process by which educators are prepared as a continuum linking preservice and staff development and bringing to bear all available resources in support of quality instruction and school improvement (pp. 6-8).

Finally, James Stone (1968) challenged us to examine strategies which can lead to genuine reform in the education of American teachers with these words:

> We are shadow-boxing with the real problem unless we are willing to develop new structures for bringing together the groups necessary for the education of our teachers—the schools, the colleges, and the communities in which the schools are located. Both the quality of American education and its quantity are involved in any decision we make at this time. At stake is the development of America's greatest natural resource, our children and youth (p. 190).

REFERENCES

Bower, E.M. *Teachers Talk About Their Feelings.* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973). pp. 7, 31, 34-35.

Bradley, H.W. and T.F. Eggleston. "An Induction Year Experiment." *Educational Research.* (Vol. 20, No. 2 1972), pp. 89-97.

Coyne, C.B. *Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education. Final Report.* (Washington , D.C.: Office of Education, 1970).

DeBruin, J.E. "PSST: Beginning Teachers Speak Out," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Sept-Oct, 1978. (Vol. XXIX, No. 5), p. 21.

Doyle, Walter. *Research on Teaching in Classroom Environments*. A paper prepared for the national invitational conference: Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research. Austin, Texas, January 1979, p. 15.

Drummond, W.H. "Role of State Department of Education." *New Perspectives on Teacher Education*. (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1973), pp. 95-96.

Gage, N.L. *Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education: The Search for a Scientific Basis*. (Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1972), p. 195.

Hartman, C.L. "A Longitudinal Look at Self-Appraisal Strategies," *Journal of Teacher Education*, September-October, 1978. (Vol. XXIX, No. 5), p. 12.

Julius, A.K. "Britain's New Induction Plan for First Year Teachers." *The Elementary School Journal*, March, 1976. (Vol. 76, No. 6), pp. 350-357.

Ladd, E.T. "Interpretation and Perspectives," *The Real World of the Beginning Teacher*, 1965, p. 82.

Lortie, D.C. "Teacher Socialization: The Robinson Crusoe Model," *The Real World of the Beginning Teacher*. Report of the 19th National TEPS Conference. (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965), p. 62.

Morris, D.B. and R.M. Ussery. *A Report on a Survey of Teacher Education Graduates: Class of 1970*. (Greenville, N.C.: Office of Institutional Research, East Carolina University, 1973.

Newberry, J. McIntosh. *The First Year of Experience: Influences on the Beginning Teacher*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, New York, 1977.

Olson, P.A., Editor. *The University Can't Train Teachers: A Symposium of School Administrators Discuss School-Based Undergraduate Education for Teachers*. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1971), pp. 87-88.

Pruitt, W.K. and J.F. Lee. "Hidden Handcuffs in Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Sept-Oct, 1978. (Vol. XXIX, No. 5), p. 70.

Ryan, K. *Survival is Not Enough: Overcoming the Problems of Beginning Teachers*. (Washington, D.C.: AFT Question, Paper #15, 1974), p. 36.

Ryan, T.F. *Testimony Prepared for a Hearing*. Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. May 25, 1979, 6-8.

Schipmann, Eugene. "Interpretation and Perspectives." *The Real World of the Beginning Teacher*, 1965, p. 69.

Stone, J.C. *Breakthrough in Teacher Education*. (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), p. 153.

"Teaching Internships." A proposal submitted to the National Institute of Education by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. July 7, 1978.

The Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. *Teacher Education in the United States: The Responsibility Gap*. (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1976).

THE INTERACTION OF CONTEXT WITH TEACHERS AND TEACHER EDUCATION: AN EMPHASIS ON THE BEGINNING YEARS

Joseph Vaughan

INTRODUCTION

Before a fuller discussion of teaching, teachers and teacher education, with particular attention to the beginning teacher, allow me to share a few basic assumptions. My years as a secondary school teacher and my work with federal programs such as Teacher Corps, Upward Bound and now with the National Institute of Education have reaffirmed my belief that teachers indeed make a difference. We not only have research evidence to support that contention, but this is self-evident to anyone who has ever spent time in a classroom. The same students act, think, feel and learn in different ways with different teachers. I underscore this seemingly obvious situation only because the teacher has been largely ignored in many efforts to improve instruction. To me, the question is not *whether* we should examine the teacher and teaching as one link to improving learning but *how* we can best examine that link.

My second basic assumption is that beginning teachers are a relatively unique and particularly important group of teachers. For those of us who have undergone some of the trauma as we began teaching, there can be little doubt that it is a unique time. It is also an important time. We know that many of the persons who leave teaching do so in those first years. There are too many unresolved problems or the individual realizes, or at least believes, that teaching is not what she/he thought it was going to be or it doesn't appear to be worth the price that has to be paid to do the job right.

There is general agreement that we have to better understand the nature of the beginning teacher's experience and formulate better means to assist them during this time. Teachers, administrators, teacher educators, parents and community appear to agree on this. At a recent planning conference hosted by NIE, over 20 educational organizational representatives determined this area to be a top priority. NIE's

first research contract in the area of staff development has been awarded to conduct a study of the nature and effectiveness of programs designed to aid beginning teachers. Last year, there were approximately 100,000 new teachers in our school systems despite a generally perceived "teacher surplus." Thus, the number of teachers in this situation even at this time is not insignificant.

A third assumption is that in order to effectively study the beginning teacher, the state-of-the-art in this area of research suggests an initial emphasis on efforts that are largely descriptive, exploratory, analytical and conceptual in nature. I would suggest that "research" be considered interchangeable with "systematic investigation" in order to be reflective of the rather embryonic research in the area but also to emphasize the point that common sense and relevance to the real world are needed.

Fourth, some understanding of and sensitivity to the phenomena to be investigated is needed. This suggests cooperation or collaboration and sharing of skills and experiences among practitioners and researchers. Isolation, elitism, and unnecessarily specialized jargon must be avoided. Frequently, research has been conducted *on* practioners instead of *with* and *for* practitioners and policy makers. Continuance of that type of research is viewed as both substantively and politically counterproductive.

Now that the reader has some idea of my perspective, let's take a look at a few things research has been able to contribute to our knowledge about teaching, teachers and teacher education in general. This will provide an appropriate framework for looking in more detail at the beginning teacher.

TEACHER EFFECTS RESEARCH

To date, much of the research relative to teaching and teacher education has been confined to what is commonly known as "teacher effects" and "instructional processes" research. The principal aim here has been to identify and describe relationships between teacher behavior and skills and student outcomes, principally achievement gains. Most of the work has been done in the mathematics and reading areas and much of it at the elementary level. It is not my intent to catalog or analyze the results of this work in any detail, since that has been done with considerable comprehensiveness and care by several persons in recent years (e.g., Medley, 1977; Good, 1979; Rosenshine (in press). Suffice it to say that many of these results point to the need for situation-specific teaching techniques utilized within an overall strategy that has come to be known most popularly as "direct instruction." Among other things direct instruction is characterized by: 1) the teacher being the center of direction and an effective manager of classroom activities; 2) much teacher emphasis and high student engagement on directly content-relevant tasks; 3) an atmosphere of cooperation and success, and 4) considerable and immediate academic feedback to students.

Although this research provides information about what some of the *content* of teacher education might include, it was not intended to address and does not help us a great deal in understanding the nature and implications of *context*. That is, it does not tell us very much about the world of the teacher beyond the nature of one instructional role with students. Neither does it begin to prescribe ways in which teacher education might effectively work with future and beginning teachers to develop or maintain these teaching behaviors which have been associated with greater student outcomes.

Thus, one need not be clairvoyant or possess the wisdom of the ages to appreciate that "teacher effects" research is necessary but not sufficient. Researchers working in this area have themselves recognized the need for many forms of complementary research. Some have discovered this via their own initiative while others have had it brought to their attention, sometimes not so gently, by teachers and other practitioners. The latter may have found the results "interesting" and "potentially" useful but did not find direction to confront a larger set of problems. These problems might include a possible incompatibility between employing these "effective behaviors" and their individual state of or orientation towards human/professional development; a lack of consonance with their classroom or school policy and procedures; or a lack of adequate time because of the multiple and complex demands being made upon them. *In other words, how does knowledge about effective behaviors relate to the CONTEXT of their world. How do these contexts influence whether one can or will exhibit those behaviors.*

A FRAMEWORK FOR ADDING TO PRESENT KNOWLEDGE

In order to move beyond teacher effects research investigation of two phenomena appear to be crucial. Let me describe those basic phenomena and then present evidence that would appear to support such an approach. The intent is to explicate the need for a specific focus on *context* as a major part of this framework. The reader should examine the adequacy of this suggested framework and perhaps consider adaptations or alternative frameworks which might prove fruitful.

The two phenomena which are suggested as focuses for future research are:

1. *teachers* who learn, develop, change to or maintain effective practices, and;
2. *intervention processes* (e.g., teacher education) designed to develop teachers' skills, knowledge, and attitudes.

Research on the *teacher*, particularly as an adult learner, must be concerned with those forces influencing teachers' learning and development. This includes factors as the culture of the teaching profession, school organizational and institutional features, community attitudes and individual teacher characteristics. Research here will begin to describe and explain the teaching/ learning processes of teachers. It

should identify those teacher changes which appear most amenable to structured interventions or context changes or placement strategies. It should help define the content of teacher education programs, as well as staff development programs for other educational personnel.

Research focussed on the *processes of intervention* will be concerned with actions and/or programs designed to affect teachers' behaviors, skills, attitudes and knowledge with the goal of improving instruction. This research describes and begins to explain those actions/programs, their relationships to various contexts and their effects on teachers. By investigating and identifying criteria of effectiveness for teacher education/ staff development to research can contribute to the development of more appropriate interventions based upon realistic expectations.

Investigation of the influence of *context* fits into this framework in the following manner. First, we need to conceptualize ways in which we can investigate the relationship of different contexts to the *teacher*, and we have to explore how contexts affect that teacher's ability to function in a fashion consistent with what is known about effective teaching behavior. Second, we need to begin to conceptualize ways in which we can investigate the relationships between *context* and the intervention of *teacher education*. Since the goal of teacher education is to assist the teacher in maintaining or developing effective teaching practices and, ultimately, to increase student learning, teacher education is a means to an end. We need to know much more about how context influences that means before we begin to even consider prescribing the ways in which to reach the desired ends.

There is a need to explain two definitions which I am utilizing here which I realize are not universally accepted. These definitions should alert the reader to the frame of reference I am using here. They might also stimulate the reader to think about his/her own definitions of the same terms and the appropriateness of both my and the reader's definitions. First, *Teacher education* is viewed here as a continuum of activities running through preservice, induction (the early years of full-responsibility teaching) and inservice (post-early years until retirement). These activities are intended for the professional and personal growth of the teacher and, ultimately, for the maximizing of student learning. Second, *context* is viewed broadly, as the *interaction* of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors of educational personnel, students and others with factors and conditions such as type of training activities, physical setting, role-expectations, socialization processes and stages of adult development. Context is *not* seen simply as structural or organizational conditions although these certainly are viewed as one part of context. My preference for this conceptualization of a multifaceted context is based in my cumulative assessment of the literature and is related to my belief that context is a *set* of *interactive* conditions (although separate context conditions may be active or static) and not a set of static conditions. The balance of the paper will be directed toward convincing the reader that this conceptualization of

context is essential if we are to accurately assess influences on the teacher and on teacher education that can be directly applied to investigating the needs of the beginning teacher.

EXISTING INVESTIGATIONS RELEVANT TO CONTEXT

The conceptual and empirical work which has examined the interaction of context, teaching (particularly teachers) and teacher education is limited but has been increasing steadily in recent years. A quick review of the types of research being discussed at conferences and in journals reveals an increase in the number of studies which are investigating contextual elements of teaching and teacher education. The work has already begun to yield valuable insights regarding the basic issues to be studied and has produced elements of useful research strategies for addressing these issues.

There is also obvious utility in some of the methodological tools that have been employed in the more traditional classroom research. Many of the ethnographic approaches, for instance, provide means by which to get a more complete picture of the classroom. They can, with adaptations, be extremely useful in looking more carefully at various dimensions of the teacher's and teacher educator's world. Case studies also can be used in more in-depth analysis of many of the elements of context. It may be premature to attempt to employ some of the other complex data analyses techniques that have been used in teacher effects research, given the lack of thorough understanding of the basic phenomena which we presently need to examine. However, these analyses have underscored for us that instruction is a complex process and cannot be reduced to simplistic and unidimensional data collection, analyses and interpretation processes.

The emerging work in this area of context includes efforts that are both conceptual and empirical in nature and also both qualitative and quantitative in emphases. As stated earlier this blend of conceptual/empirical and qualitative/ quantitative appears necessary in seeking a more complete mapping of the terrain. This approach also gives us the opportunity to simultaneously examine the relationship of theory to practice and vice versa in order that one might inform the other.

Kurt Lewin and others have pointed out the interrelatedness of theory and practice and the artificiality and inappropriateness of trying to separate them or present them as simply linear or sequential in nature. Koehler (1979) has presented a useful delineation of two types of research that were originally identified by Gage (1966). She has further explicated improvements and descriptive research. She proposed they serve as complementary research techniques in the study of teaching and teacher education. Briefly, she explains the basic difference in that *improvement* research is designed to directly contribute to the improvement of practice while *descriptive* research is intended to "understand or produce knowledge about a phenomenon . . . with an aim of theory development to be used in understanding what is happening, and/or how or why things happen the way they do."

Although studies may employ elements of both of these approaches, I have taken the liberty of categorizing several studies in an attempt to illustrate the relationship of context, teaching and teacher education. I have done so with no intent to "pigeon-hole" the work but rather to see how important aspects of respective efforts might be thought of in terms of their potential contributions to addressing the issues I have enumerated. With advance apologies to those who would argue that they have been inaccurately interpreted or misplaced, I shall proceed.

IMPROVEMENT RESEARCH

This would appear to have the most immediate appeal to practitioners and policy-makers because it works more directly toward bringing about better practice. It is also the type of research which has been less in evidence in regard to context, teaching and teacher education because it requires some criteria of effectiveness and judgments about more and less effective processes. Since we know little about the processes of context and its interaction with other elements, it is very difficult to design valid studies of this nature at this time. Nevertheless, there are improvement studies which focus primarily on one element (e.g., teacher education) and which shed much needed light on the implications for context.

One set of examples would be attempts to derive teacher education treatments from teacher effectiveness results and to test the effectiveness of those treatments in helping teachers to exhibit those behaviors desirable for increased student learning.

One experimental study I have placed in this category (Stallings, et al., 1978), was conducted at the secondary level and has several implications for looking at the differential influences of context on the impact of teacher education treatments. A series of teacher workshops were held which were built upon teacher effects results. After substantial classroom observation, teachers were provided feedback on the nature of the instructional processes in their classrooms. The teachers then worked with the researchers to explore ways in which the teachers might try to increase or develop behaviors believed to be correlated with effective instruction. Subsequent workshops continued to aid teachers in putting those behaviors into practice within the specific context of their classrooms. A quasi-clinical study during the second year of the effort (with half the teachers having received training and half not having received it) revealed that trained teachers did tend to go up in or maintain their level of effective behaviors but that there was considerable variation.

The investigators' analyses of the information available on *context* seems to indicate the possibility that contextual conditions serve an important mediating role in determining how treatments are or are not converted to changed behaviors. Such school policies as teachers rotating from classroom to classroom, and variable grading systems, were viewed as having impact. Within-school variations were as prevalent as

between-school variations. All of which points to the crucial need to understand the various types of context and their relationships to teaching behavior. The specific degree of impact of these contextual factors was not investigated in this study nor was the extent to which they interacted with treatments to bring about changes in teacher behavior. Thus, one could make a very strong argument that a closer look at these factors is an essential next step in completing more of the picture.

There have been numerous experimental studies which investigated the impact of various teacher education treatments on teacher behavior and student outcomes. Gage and Crawford (1978) utilized path analysis techniques to attempt to determine causal relationships among teacher education treatments, classroom behaviors and, student outcomes in third grade classrooms. They assessed entering pupil abilities and teacher characteristics (e.g., verbal ability, self-report of structuredness of teaching style) and then instituted a limited (materials only) and full (materials and workshops) treatment and a control group over a November to January time span. The treatments were successful in producing implementation of the desired behaviors on the part of the experimental teachers and in producing high student time on task (you'll recall this as a central element of the direct intructional construct). In addition, when parents assisted in working with the students, results were even more positive in terms of student achievement. This study represents one of the first attempts of this type of research and thus does have some methodological and conceptual areas that are ripe for discussion and debate. It does, however, demonstrate the potential for changing teacher behaviors and increasing those behaviors which correlate strongly with increased achievement. Anderson, Evertson, and Brophy (1979) showed similar results in a study of first grade classrooms utilizing extensive direct observation of classrooms and teacher/student interaction. Good and Grouws (1978) found that relatively simple treatments, this time with fourth grade mathematics teachers, can lead to significant changes in teacher behavior and student achievement. Better understanding of these relationships is essential before we can profess legitimate understanding of and justification for drawing relationships between teacher education treatments and the ultimate dependent variable, at least in many people's minds, of student outcomes. There is a weak knowledge link between treatment and changed behavior and we have limited information on which to base decisions about how to increase congruence between treatments and the reality of the teacher's context. There are problems in attempting to conduct this type of research, and they range from sampling and the unit of analysis issues to the appropriate ways to utilize combinations of both quantitative and qualitative information (Koehler, 1978; Schalock, 1979).

DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH

Recalling that the aim of this type of research is better understanding of phenomena and theory development and that there is no concern for a criterion of effectiveness, the range of relevant activities is much broader than the case in improvement research. There simply does not appear to be a sufficient knowledge base or conceptual clarity about the effects of context and so more of this type of work has been in evidence.

Two examples of this type of research will be reviewed here. The first examined in a nonexperimental fashion, what happens when one tries to use researchers as a basis for bringing about teacher improvement through collaborative research/implementation and the second investigated the impact of the change process, particularly on the teacher, when an innovation (e.g., teacher education activities) is being introduced. A major strength of these studies may well lie in the fact that they have incorporated both empirical and conceptual work in their efforts.

The first study, utilized an approach called Interactive Research and Development on Teaching, and employed many of the underlying principles which in earlier years were known by various titles such as "action research" and "cooperative studies." The design,

> places teachers, researchers and trainer/developers together to inquire as a team, beginning with the initiation of the R&D process, into the questions, problems and concerns of classroom teachers. The team is charged with conducting research and concurrently developing training based on both their research findings and the research methods and procedures employed in their study. Decisions are made collaborative . . . each member of the team has parity and shares equal responsibility for the team's decisions and actions (Ward & Tikunoff, 1979).

This research has yielded detailed information on the nature of the context in which the research and development were planned and carried out and the impact of that context on implementation. The high degree of active teacher involvement, the sense of "ownership" and "efficacy" which evolved, and the perceived value of the overall process by participants all suggest that the type of research and teacher training evidenced in this project, was consonant with the school context of teachers. The IR & DT project is not the only attempt to utilize descriptive research methodologies to gain insights into an appropriate context for teaching and teacher education (e.g., Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel, 1977) and the need for continuation of these studies to increase our knowledge base is critical.

A second example is the work initiated by Fuller and more fully conceptualized and developed by Hall. It is being carried out through an effort known as the Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations project (Hall, 1978). That work provides means by which the individual concerns of innovation users (e.g., teachers) can be assessed along with the degree to which and reasons why these users are or are not implementing the innovation. The implications of that work are considerable in terms of the information it could generate in order to make an

innovation such as specific teacher education activities more compatible with and palatable to the users and the specific context in which the innovation will be implemented.

Furthermore, the project is now beginning to conceptualize the alternative interventions that might be appropriate in increasing the successful adoption or adaptation of innovations and this will involve in-depth consideration of how the *context* will interact with these interventions and the innovation.

Research such as this has pointed up the need for information and understanding about at least three factors: 1) what are the specific dimensions of the workplace and the nature of the interactions of these dimensions, 2) what is the nature and perspectives of the individual teacher that is functioning in that workplace, and 3) what is the nature and effect of interventions which are designed to serve certain purposes and to what extent are those purposes congruent and compatible with both 1) and 2).

A LOOK AT BEGINNING TEACHERS

Another example, particularly relevant to beginning teaching, is Doyle's (1979) three-year study of secondary teachers. He studied teachers beginning with student teaching and attempted to build a "descriptive theory of classrooms." He has developed a "trajectory of induction" or general pattern of events that teachers follow in learning to become teachers and/or adjusting to teaching and the workplace. Although this work would be classified as research on teaching and instruction processes, Doyle has really taken it a step further because he has taken the grounded theory of classroom environments that has been developed and addressed the implications of this for various phases of teacher education. For example, one aspect of the work describes classroom as having functions of *multidimensionality*, *simultaneity*, *immediacy*, *unpredictability* and *history*, all of which are realities to be faced by the teacher as he/she strives toward a basic goal such as "securing the cooperation of students in classroom activities."

The basic problem of teaching and teacher education, as seen by Doyle, is the need to find ways to translate the knowledge ("schema") that a teacher possesses into activities techniques ("scripts") that are compatible with the complexity of the classroom. He proposed the need for both additional research on *classroom knowledge* (e.g., naturalistic studies of teacher planning and how effective "scripts" are selected) and on *teaching classroom understandings* (e.g., visual displays of "scripts" to accompany verbal descriptions and conceptual frameworks presently comprising teacher education.) He underscored the need for more research on the complex processes of learning to be a teacher in the classroom.

Fenstermacher (1979) took a complementary but more philosophical view of how we need to examine the influence of context on teaching and teacher education. He is also concerned with the nature and the influ-

ence of the workplace and with induction, or initial teaching, which he feels to be the most formative stage where these influences are brought to bear. He discussed specific examples of what he called "institutional characteristics of schooling" which appear worthy of investigation as powerful influences (e.g., power and authority patterns, reward structures, technical language systems and symbols, organizational structures and relationships).

As a point of differentiation from Doyle, however, Fenstermacher is interested in how these contextual factors influence "intentions" of teachers as well as how teacher education does (or does not) influence these intentions. He hypothesized that teachers have "intentions in storage" (formulated elsewhere but found unuseable in practice) and "intentions in use" (what the teacher *has* to do as a result of the realities of induction.)

Fenstermacher maintained that "teacher education shares responsibility for understanding how institutional features may (or may not, I would add) be altered to facilitate the conversion of a teacher's new knowledge or skill to intentions in use." In another paper (in press 1979) he argued that teacher education should also explore the extent to which it encourages "rule conversion" (direct translation of research results into practice) at the expense of "transformation" (where evidence is presented and the teacher is assisted in learning how to adapt or adopt the evidence in view of the context). The Interactive Research and Development on Teaching project also suggested that something very similar to "transformation" strategies was the best way to help teachers utilize research results and, to a much greater extent, involve them in the processes of research.

Fenstermacher's work is also related in many ways to what Elliot (1977) referred to as the "self monitoring" teacher and to Feiman's (1979) suggestion that we need to locate and study environments deliberately designed to foster transformation strategies. Fox's (1977) study of Teacher Corps interns and their induction into the classroom reinforces the point that "rule conversion" models where rigid expectations were developed in preservice teachers, no matter how well-founded in research evidence, tend to result in Fenstermacher's "intentions in storage" when the nature of induction into the classroom is so traumatic and unexpected that very different needs or "intentions in use" overwhelm the prior learning. Some of the unexpected contextual conditions in Fox's study included the fact that interns were not given full responsibility for anything "significant" in their classrooms, they were not provided with sufficient direction from experienced colleagues, and they had difficulty developing relationships with other teachers who saw them more as trainees than colleagues.

These latter concerns bring one to another aspect of context that has been frequently discussed but little understood; the socialization processes encountered by teachers. While the trauma of this has been emphasized (e.g., Lortie, 1975) we still have an abundance of untested

hypotheses in teacher education, derived from other disciplines, about how and when various stages of socialization take place and what, if anything, teacher education could do to ameliorate the trauma that appears attached to it. This process is particularly critical for new teachers, whether just out of college or newly assigned to a different school or district. Fyfield, Taylor and Tisher (1978) have summarized several hypotheses. These include the beginning teacher's recollection of experiences with previous teachers as role models (Lortie, 1966), with the dominant socialization roles of peers and persons in authority (Edgar and Warren, 1969), with the impact of pupils on teachers (Haller, 1967; Halley, 1969). Lacey (1977) suggested that socialization is an interactive process with these and other factors combining with individual characteristics of the teacher to determine the rate and nature of socialization.

One final area that warrants further conceptual work and hypothesis development is the relationship between adult developmental stages and the education of teachers. Although most work on human development has focused on children, adolescents and abnormal adults, there are emerging theories of adult development. Efforts are being made to validate predictors of adult "success" in various professions and life functions. Sprinthall (1979) informed us of the work which has shown the failure of academic achievement and scholastic aptitude to predict adult success (Nicholson, 1970; Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972; McClelland, 1973). The factors that do evolve as predictors of success are developmental concepts such as Heath's (1977) "psychological maturity" and Hunt and Sullivan's (1974) "levels of conceptual maturity." Both of these conceptions of adult development identify measurable behaviors which are characteristic of persons at various stages or levels of these concepts. At higher developmental levels, "success" as adults appears to be more prevalent. In the case of the Hunt and Sullivan teachers and counselors have been the subjects of study. Although one may argue that the characteristics indicative of persons at Hunt and Sullivan's higher conceptual levels do not necessarily coincide with effective teaching behaviors in certain situation-specific cases, they may on the surface be indicative of more global and permeating behaviors which contribute to student learning. This work holds promise for providing a much more complete picture of the nature of the individual with whom teacher educators will try to work and it also should be useful in telling us more about teacher educators themselves.

Some work has been done in attempting to develop higher conceptual levels with preservice and inservice teachers (Hunt and N. Sprinthall, 1976; N. Sprinthall and Bernier, 1978) and mixed results have been evidenced. These are only starting points, however, and there is much more that needs to be examined in terms of how movement along these stages relate to various teacher education and teaching contexts. It is too early to call for drastic changes in teacher education on the basis of new-found and insufficiently examined information about stages of

adult development but it appears to be one more critical factor that should be considered. In some research adult development will be an independent contextual variable itself and at other times a variable dependent on context.

As I examined documents and spoke to persons as one means of preparing the above information, several impressions evolved. First, there is not a thorough understanding of or systematic thought about the basic nature and possible relationship of the elements comprising the "context" in teaching and teacher education. Second, it appears unreasonable to arbitrarily attempt to examine context as a discrete and isolated factor that should be considered without either integrated or parallel consideration of other factors such as the content or the process of teaching and teacher education. Time and time again, various practitioners, researchers and others writing on the subject of context inevitably related it, at least partially, with elements of content and process. Perhaps it is necesary and even crucial to be as specific as we can in defining the nature of context for purposes of conducting research on it but logic and initial work in the area indicate much interrelatedness with other factors. Third, although there were some implications for practice that were perhaps self-evident in analyzing the conceptual and empirical work which we already have on context, for the most part the existing efforts have served to identify issues and possible ways in which these issues could be considered in seeking further conceptual clarity or filling in knowledge gaps. Therefore, we should be cautious in seeking direct implications for practice in teacher education and teaching and perhaps first concentrate on what is presently known about the effects of context and where and how we need to look for additional insights.

AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

I would like to describe a few key areas where conceptual clarity and descriptive work is perhaps most crucial as a prelude to establishing and evaluating alternative approaches to aiding the beginning teacher.

Articulation—Many times we tend to identify separate stages of teacher education (preservice, induction, inservice) and teaching (beginning and experienced) without considering the similarities and differences among them. If we would consider them as different points on a continuum perhaps it would enable us to explore any interrelationships more clearly. What happens in inservice probably does not happen in isolation of what has occurred earlier in induction any more than what happens in induction occurs in isolation of what has taken place in preservice. Obviously it would be to our advantage to understand and enhance the articulation that does take place and examine whether or not more is desirable.

We have not done a very good job to date of identifying the kinds of relationships existing between these phases of teacher education. Many questions can be raised for study. Are there areas of teacher education, for example, that are presently the responsibility of higher education

that might better or more appropriately be conducted by local education agencies or a consortium of higher education and school personnel? Are there instances where the reverse is true? Are there stages or phases of adult development that parallel teacher development and make certain types of teacher education/staff development more effective and appropriate at certain points than at others? Why is there usually trauma connected with the transition from preservice to induction and what factors seem to have the most influence on this transition? Are there roughly similar points on the continuum when prospective or practicing teachers make key decisions regarding their behaviors or attitudes toward teaching and teacher education? What are those points, these decisions, and what causes these decisions to be made at those points? What are the implications of those decisions and how amenable are they to influence by intervention? These are only a few of the multitude of questions which may be worthy of investigation.

Collaboration—If we accept the idea of a continuum of teaching and teacher education, then that seems to speak strongly for a more collaborative approach to identifying, describing, analyzing and working to improve the articulation among the points on that continuum. Each member of the collaborative arrangement has a unique contribution to make and a vested interest in wanting to actively contribute in order to maintain or gain benefits from the overall process. In addition, stable or declining resources would appear to encourage this type of collaboration as a way to insure maximal resource utilization and to minimize gaps and/or duplication. Collaboration also has the potential advantage of helping each collaborator better understand the position of the others and see how that position may ultimately influence their own position.

In some ways, collaboration is both a means and an end since it can be a way of identifying and investigating key issues while also being a potentially desirable outcome in terms of enhancing the process of articulation. At no point is this more critical than at the transition to beginning teaching, since it is here that a teacher's allegiances and concerns switch from one sponsoring agency (higher education) to another (schools). Research questions regarding collaboration, then, are concerned with not only the orchestration of the process but also with centrally involving the beginning teacher in the determination of that process. How is the beginning teacher to be involved? What type of incentive and/or support is offered for involvement in the collaborative approach? How are various levels of expertise as well as personal and professional power addressed in a collaborative model? How does the continually developing beginning teacher matriculate through the identified consortium? What types of resources are available and best utilized by the beginning teacher? The list of questions to be investigated could be extended. Suffice it to note that the collaborative approach itself will not only address such questions but add additional ones as well.

Interdisciplinary considerations—It is apparent from some of the studies described earlier that many of the factors which influence teachers, teaching and teacher education have to do with conditions and actions that require knowledge of areas outside education. Adult development is a prime area that needs further explication, first in its own domain and then as it relates to teachers and teacher education/staff development. Understanding socialization processes is of particular importance to the issue of beginning teachers since this is usually the time of most severe trauma. The tools of disciplines such as anthropology and its descriptive branch, ethnography, can be extremely useful in gaining many types of increased understanding and reproducing a more complete picture of the teacher's life. Certainly, economics and political science have much to contribute. We have not taken full advantage of these disciplines in our consideration of teachers, teaching and teacher education, and we would probably do well to correct that oversight.

Complimentary and mutually supportive development of all educational personnel—Although discussion has focussed on the teacher because she/he is the most d ct point of impact on the ultimate concern of student learning, to do so in isolation of other educational personnel would indeed be unwise. Most of what we have learned about change to or maintenance of effective behaviors in our schools points to the important contributions made by factors such as administrative involvement and support and community environment. Just as elements of context interact with teachers, teaching and teacher education, so do other educational personnel interact directly or indirectly in many ways with teachers and teacher education. It is obvious these other educational personnel comprise one important aspect of that overall context.

Logically, there is also very little prospect of success in the three previously mentioned areas of articulation, collaboration, and interdisciplinary consideration unless educational personnel at all levels are developed along parallel lines. To be sure, the development of any particular role group may be more crucial in some areas than others. As just one example that is relevant to beginning teachers, we need to know much more about the role of and potentially effective behaviors for experienced teachers/tutors who are assigned responsibilities for working with beginning teachers. What means are used for selecting these cooperating teachers, how are they trained for this responsibility and how do they interact with new teachers? What are both their perceptions and the new teacher's perceptions of the adequacy of this arrangement?

I am in no way suggesting that these four areas are sufficient for undertaking a full examination of teaching, teachers and teacher education, but they do, hopefully, offer major parts of a framework which would enable us to get at key aspects and questions which we have not yet satisfactorily addressed. There is a need, I would argue, to look at these areas not just for beginning teachers but for all teachers at various points on the teaching continuum. The answers which we will ultimately receive to the types of questions in these areas may well be expected to be different for beginning teachers than for more experienced teachers

or preservice candidates but the process of inquiry and the need to address the four areas remains very similar across the continuum points.

IN CONCLUSION

One could get very frustrated when looking at just the range of information necessary and the problems of acquiring, analyzing, interpreting and utilizing it. In addition, the topics touched upon here are only part of that which is needed. The criterion question of what is effective teacher education must provide an undergirding and direction for how many areas are to be addressed. We do have practical alternatives in terms of the actual *conduct* of the research but it is in the area of decisions on what and when to research, and at what cost, that decision-makers will have to bite the bullet. That process is both complex and time-consuming.

Schalock (1979) has spoken with considerable perceptivity about the need for the type of research which will better address such crucial teacher educator concerns as necessary bases for selection of candidates and for certification standards. He spoke to the importance of these issues not only to teacher educators but as matters of "public trust." It is these areas which are perceived by the public as being the most obvious control points for quality education of our children. Thus, it cannot be only academic concerns with which this research concerns itself. Accountability and the pressures of stagnant or reduced resources are going to force us to make better use of what we have. Many potentially researchable issues that have had limited visibility and priority in the past will now be prime subjects for investigation simply because they are now being questioned. If certain policies and practices are to be maintained or given higher priority, then research must help provide the justification for such actions just as it must help provide the justification for termination or revision of inappropriate or ineffective practices. Unfortunatley or fortunately, depending on your perspective, both teaching and teacher education fall within those areas in need of clarification and explanation.

But we should be challenged, not disheartened, by this state. The beginning work that has been mentioned here should give us some degree of confidence that we at least have recognized some of the problems and that is always a necessary first step. Institutions like the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State and the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education in Austin, Texas, have explored and will continue to explore new approaches to addressing the overall issues in teacher education. Collaborative research efforts involving teachers, teacher educators, researchers and other relevant personnel have shown that this approach has considerable promise. Several individuals and colleagues cited in this paper and many who have not been mentioned because of space limitations will continue to add more insights to the process of deciding upon appropriate purposes,

goals, procedures and uses for research on teacher education. In terms of beginning teachers specifically, Kevin Ryan and his colleagues continue to write accurately and eloquently about both the nature of that situation and directions for improvement. The aforementioned NIE project (being conducted by Fred McDonald and Pat Elias at the Educational Testing Service) is looking at staff development programs attempting to ease the transition into beginning teaching, and should yield many clues about future directions for inquiry.

We need to examine these hypotheses much more closely if we are ever to hope to break out of the unfortunate state of viewing the various stages of teaching and teacher education as anything other than "black boxes" (Ryan, 1979). The needs are evident and are being defined in a more clear manner. Conceptual and empirical work is beginning to provide directions. We need to get on with the work of building upon that foundation to develop the necessary understanding of the interactive nature of context, teaching and teacher education and then to use that knowledge for the betterment of practice, including the state of conditions for beginning teachers.

[1]This chapter represents an adaptation and expansion of a paper originally prepared for the April, 1979 American Educational Research Association conference in San Francisco. The views expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the National Institute of Education or the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, L., Evertson, C. and Brophy, J. An Experimental Study of Teaching Effectiveness in First Grade Reading Groups, *Elementary School Journal* (in press).

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E. and Amarel, M. *Collaborative Research*. Paper presented at the Third Annual Conference on Research in the Arts and Aesthetic Education. Aspen, Colorado, 1977.

Edgar, D. and Warren, R. "Power and Autonomy in Teacher Socialization," *Sociology of Education*, Volume 42, 1969.

Elliot, J. "Developing Hypotheses About Classrooms from Teachers' Practical Constructs: An Account of the Work of the Ford Teaching Project," *Interchange*, Volume 7, No. 2, 1976-77.

Feiman, S. *Growth and Reflection as Aims in Teacher Education: Directions for Research*. Paper presented at conference on "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research," Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Austin, Texas, 1979.

Fenstermacher, G. *What Needs to be Known about What Teachers Need to Know?* Paper presented at conference on "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research," Research and Development Center for Teacher Education: Austin, Texas, 1979.

Fenstermacher, G. *On Learning to Teach Effectively from Research on Teacher Effectiveness*. To be included in publications on the findings and implication of the California Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (in press in 1979).

Fox, T. *The Dynamic Nature of Teacher Professional Development*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Assocation Conference, New York, 1977.

Fyfield, J., Taylor, S. and Tisher, R. *The Induction of Beginning Teachers in Australia*. Final draft of a Research Report on Stage II of the Teacher Education Project. Mohash University, 1978.

Gage, N. Research on Cognitive Aspects of Teaching. *The Way Teaching Is*. Washington, D.C. ASCD and NEA Center for the Study of Instruction, 1966.

Gage, N. and Crawford, J. *An Experiment on Teacher Effectiveness and Parent-Assisted Instruction in the Third Grade: Volume 1*. Preliminary Final Report. Center for Educational Research at Stanford. Palo Alto, California, 1978.

Good, T. "What We Know About Teacher Effectiveness in the Elementary School Now," *Journal of Teacher Education* (in press).

Good, T. and Grouws, D. The Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project: An Experimental Study in Fourth Grade Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology* (in press).

Haller, E. "Pupil Influence in Teacher Socialization: A Socio-Linguistic Study," *Sociology of Education*, Volume 40, 1967.

Heath, D. *Maturity and Competence*. Gardner Publishing. New York, 1977.

Hoy, W. "Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization: A Further Examination of the Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," *School Review*, Volume 77, 1969.

Hunt, D. and Sullivan, E. *Between Psychology and Education*. Dryden, New York, 1974.

Hunt, B. and Sprinthall, N. "Psychological and Moral Development for Teacher Education," *Journal of Moral Education*, Volume 6, No. 2, 1976.

Koehler, V. "*Methodology for Research on Teacher Training*," Paper presented at the conference on "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research," Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Austin, Texas, 1979.

Kohlberg, L. and Mayer, R. "Development as the Aim of Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, Volume 42, No. 4, 1972.

Lortie, D. "Teacher Socialization. The Robinson Crusoe Model," *The Real World of the Beginning Teacher*. Report of the 19th National TEPS Conference. National Education Association. Washington, D.C. 1966.

Lortie, D. *School Teacher: A Sociological Study*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 1975.

McClelland, D. "Testing for Competence Rather Than Intelligence," *American Psychologist*, Volume 28, No. 1. 1973.

Medley, D. *Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. 1977.

Nicholson, E. *Success and Admission Criteria for Potentially Successful Risks*. Project Report. Ford Foundation and Brown University: Providence, Rhode Island, 1970.

Rosenshine, B. "Content, Time and Direct Instruction," In P. Peterson and H. Walberg (eds.) Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications. Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing (in press).

Ryan, K. Inside the Black Boxes: The Process of Teacher Education. Paper presented at conference on "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research." Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Austin, Texas: 1979.

Schalock, H.D. *Eating Humble Pie: Notes on Methodology in Teacher Education Research*. Paper presented at the conference on "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research." Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Austin, Texas, 1979.

Sprinthall, N. *Adults as Learners: A Developmental Perspective*. Paper presented at conference on "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research." Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Austin, Texas, 1979.

Sprinthall, N. and Bernier, J. "Moral and Cognitive Development of Teachers." *New Catholic World*, Volume 221, No 1324, 1978.

Stallings, J., Cory, R., Fairweather, J. and Needels, M. *A Study of Basic Reading Skills taught in Secondary Schools*. SRI International Menlo Park, California, 1978.

Ward, B. and Tikunoff, W. Chapter 1: Introduction. *Final Report of the Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project*. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. San Francisco, California (in press).

A SUPERINTENDENT'S PERSPECTIVE OF SUPPORT FOR TEACHERS IN THE BEGINNING YEARS

H. Vaughn Phelps

For many years those responsible for the training and staffing of education personnel were confronted with a shortage of personnel. From the forties to the seventies the need often was for "warm bodies." Teacher education institutions did their best to keep up with numbers often at the expense of their desire to do adequate research, model new programs, and experiment with ideas. It is somewhat understandable that not much was done to advance teacher education.

As the century draws its curtain, however, a different set of conditions and new opportunities present themselves. Temporary enrollment declines have relieved training institutions from the strain of graduating large numbers of teachers. While faculty have also diminished, there appear to be substantial resources available to dream, to research, and to develop models which hopefully will improve the quality of the teacher training programs.

The evolution of the relatively raw product who desires to become a teacher to the eventual (never final!) product who succeeds as a teacher is a process that has neither been well planned nor charted. Well-conceived schemes for the initial phases of teaching are especially rare. The time is now to remedy this condition.

I should add that it is not only the beginning teacher who must make basic transitions. As a case in point, nearly 15 years ago a beautiful new elementary school was built which had an open space concept. The various instructional spaces were to be used for team teaching. It was heralded by its proponents as the ideal facility for more diverse and responsive teaching. It was an early prototype of many current facilities of like nature.

There were problems, however. The problem was not really the new environment but the corresponding program and organization. While the teachers had read about team teaching and open concept, they had no first hand experience. In those days team teaching was more like turn teaching! The cooperating university was not preparing teachers who had teaming and open concept skills. They were even reluctant to allow future teachers to practice in the new and open facility.

That specific elementary school faculty, it is pleasing to report, succeeded, however modestly, that first year. Perhaps survived is a better term. Through their own resources and perseverance they developed

over time a program that in many respects is a model for today. No credit, however, can be given to a *planned, sequential training program* for helping teachers succeed in a new environment and setting. What was basically a long-term process of trial and error may have been avoided. The same may be said for the beginning teacher. One difference is that the process is not always long-term. Many quit, others become less than self-renewing.

The unique needs of the beginning teacher are well documented throughout this book. Allow me to share one further example of this. Recently an adjoining school system completed a survey of professional educators perceptions of their satisfaction with initial college preparation! They used the six topical categories patterned after those developed by the national Iota Council (1970). These included the teacher as an instructional leader, the teacher as a child advocate and advisor, the teacher as a translator of society, the teacher as a member of the teaching staff, the teacher as a professional, and the teacher as a school-community liaison.

The teachers responded to 65 separate questions within these six headings. Forty-one of the 65 items were identified as both high need areas relative to the teacher's success in teaching on the one hand and lacking at the same time in terms of the teacher's perception of the initial training they received in these areas. These data forcefully suggest that a review of present practice in teacher training is in order.

While the reader is referred to the original study for a more detailed analysis, a few examples of areas of high concern might be illustrative here.

- The ability to plan and implement strategies that adequately motivate all students.
- The ability to effectively use classroom management techniques.
- The ability to meet the academic, social, and emotional needs of *students who are discipline problems*.
- The ability to assess student behavioral and social problems.
- The ability to assess, diagnose, and remediate students' learning difficulties.
- The ability to plan effective instructional activities based on educational diagnosis.
- The ability to teach skills in cooperation and provide opportunities for students to learn to work effectively as group members.
- The ability to develop curriculum materials and plan instructional activities that will meet the unique needs of each boy and girl in the classroom.
- The ability to teach problem-solving skills to students.
- The ability to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional activities.

In a concluding statement, based upon the above analysis and a second section of their report, the investigators concluded:

> There appears to be a great disparity between those practices the teachers who responded to this survey believe should be and those they perceive as actually occurring in teacher preparation programs. . . . The teachers

further believe teacher education programs do not prepare them for the realities of teaching nor provide them with as wide an array of skills and knowledge as is needed, to the extent they should. These teachers also feel that teacher education programs do not adequately bridge the gap between theory and reality.

As all of us are aware, most traditional models for the training (education) of teachers require a baccalaureate degree with various subject matter requirements (usually a major, especially at the secondary level) and a modicum of "practice teaching" varying from one quarter of full days to a two-semester program including part of each day. The elementary student teacher also pursues course work in the application of subject implementation (methods), general educational processes, and the psychological development of children. The secondary trained teacher usually has 18 to 25 hours of "educational" related courses, *including practice teaching*, plus a major requiring 30 to 60 hours and a minor field of interest.

Clearly the elementary trained teacher has had more "how to" courses than the secondary teacher and, in turn, the secondary teacher has a more in-depth study in a particular content area. Rarely does any teacher preparation exceed 125 to 135 quarter credit hours and many are less.

The only real "linkage" between the schools and the teacher training institution occurs at the student teaching phase. School systems, in cooperation with the college or university, jointly assign a cooperating teacher or teachers with whom the potential teacher will practice teach. The institution of higher education normally employs "supervising" instructors who observe the teacher-in-training occasionally.

"Linkage" in some preparation programs may more precisely spell out an induction process from entrance to the program culmination to the culminating practice teaching experience, but not beyond. This is not typical, however. Most programs leave the practice/theory/practice phase in the hands of what is hopefully a skilled teacher. This person relies upon her/his experience in guiding the novitiate through experiences which range from observation to planning to partial lesson implementation to total class involvement. I should underscore again that many teacher training institutions are beyond this practice. However, many are not.

WHERE TO NOW?

From Horace Mann's teacher on one end of a log and a learner on the other, educators have dreamed of developing educational programs truly reflecting the needs of individual learners. In the last decade there have been some good examples of school programs which better deliver individually prescribed studies geared to the level and need of the individual student. Better diagnosis, prescription, implementation, and evaluation are not uncommon. While certainly some programs have promised more than they have been able to deliver, the positive direc-

tion cannot be debated. The recent passage of a federal law which requires handicapped students be provided an educational program based upon an I.E.P. (individualized educational prescription) further reenforces the distance that education has come by placing an individual learner as the focus of instructional planning rather than group activity. Much is yet to be done, but momentum has been established.

If indeed teachers (as students) learn by precept and example, it should follow (or precede?) that the future teacher may well profit from more individually prescribed programs. These programs could be more geared to the experiences of a young, maturing adult and they would focus upon the critical needs of the teacher when he or she first begins to teach.

This writer would argue from a multiple model approach in preparing future teachers. Not only is there probably no one best way, but there are increased chances of finding quality approaches that will best fit individual institutions—its unique group of educators, students, and different but legitimate philosophic postures. Nonetheless, each of these programs would likely incorporate the following practices:

- The identification of potential teachers as early as the sophomore year in college. (A case could be made for identifying selected individuals already in high school and providing scholarship support to ensure teachers of the highest quality.)
- An early experience in working with children at different age levels in different settings. (Let us make sure these future teachers enjoy working with children and then discover which age children they work best with.)
- Well articulated developmental sequences of experiences which incorporate skill development, a sound knowledge base, and a growing involvement with children and experienced teachers of many types.
- The opportunity for the future teacher to be an active participant and decision-maker in educational teams organized throughout to assist him/her in becoming a successful teacher.
- A joint commitment by the teacher training institutions and local school districts to the preparation of future teachers.
- A joint commitment by the teacher training institution and the local school district to the successful implementation of a well-delineated induction phase for the beginning teacher.
- And finally, a recognition that teacher education, like other professions simply cannot be accomplished in four academic years, but is a continuing process. What is critical is that much more attention be given to what is done during initial and induction phases of this process.

At this time I would like to share an example of one cooperative program which I have been involved in and which, I believe, has been a genuine advance in this direction.

ONE MODEL: U.N.O. - WESTSIDE

Joint discussions between staff at the College of Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and representatives from the Westside Community Schools have resulted in a cooperative effort to improve teacher education. While the Westside school system recruits teachers from a variety of institutions, the University of Nebraska at Omaha has always provided a strong core group of new teachers. There has been a history of good working relationships between the institutions and a number of former Westside staff members now serve on the college staff. (This is pointed out only as a healthy beginning.)

Initial meetings with University and school district members identified problem areas in teacher education. Common points of agreement and disagreement were debated as problem identification and problem solution modes were set—negotiations were constantly taking place. Gradually ideas became paper plans and blueprints for action.

THE SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The action plan began by selecting, during the second semester of their freshman year, specific high-potential individuals desirous of becoming teachers. These students would then be given the opportunity to opt into the teacher education program as sophomores and would be trained to teach in a specific school system, namely Westside, District 66.

Inasmuch as Westside schools were in a period of declining enrollment, it was not possible to guarantee the student teacher a position upon the completion of the program. It was felt, however, that the educational program would be valuable to the individual's transferability to other school systems. The Westside schools did commit themselves, however, to giving a program participant high priority in their hiring practice. With this assurance and a three-to-four-year lead time for placement planning, the individuals were, for all practical purposes guaranteed a job in Westside schools.

THE TRIAL PROGRAM

The continuing experience of working directly within the school system would begin during the students' sophomore year. The initial experience would involve structured observations with concomitant assignments and the development of specific competencies. In the junior year, students ideally would be employed by the school system as paraeducators during the time that they would have available. The senior year would be completed with the traditional practice teaching experience for one total semester. No remuneration would be paid for this segment of the student's training. It was expected that students would complete their baccalaureate degree and be certified to teach at the completion of the fourth year.

The student's fifth year would be planned as an intern year. The

student would continue to participate in a college credit course program and also be employed by the school system half time and would be paid at one-half the regular beginning salary. Some students could complete their masters degree program by the end of the fifth year if they attended complete summer programs.

SPECIAL COMMENT

Many potential teachers are discouraged from completing a Masters degree program without teaching experience for fear they will not be employed because of the increased cost a school system would have to pay for their services under existing salary procedures. The U.N.O.-Westside plan mandated the fifth year in order to be employed by Westside. The increased Masters degree salary prospect after the fifth year as well as the half-salary during the fifth year is an encouraging feature of the plan for those individuals planning to teach in the Westside schools.

THE COMPETENCIES

During the summer of 1977 teams of personnel from the University and the Westside schools worked to select and develop a series of competencies which were to be achieved during the work in the schools. These competencies were additional to the regular sequential requirements of course work in the College of Education.

A Competency Progress Team (CPT) was created for each student. The team consists of the cooperating teacher, a university monitor and, of prime importance, the student. The inclusion of the student as a part of the planning and and evaluation team is a major feature of the model. This inclusion enhances the direct and immediate feedback to the student while providing flexibility in negotiating the student's teacher training and induction into the profession.

The planning of the competencies was a collaborative effort of representatives from the school and University. A group of identified competencies which would be required for each student was developed for the sophomore year, junior year, senior (student teaching) year, and the fifth (intern) year. Separate competencies were developed for the elementary level and the secondary level. The required competencies were agreed upon by the teams as important to the success of a future teacher.

More specifically, the intern year which is intended to provide the intern with a flexible program designed for continued growth in instructional skills, indepth involvement in at least one area of specialization within the school community, and involvement in selected areas of the total community, has the following four specific goals. The intern will;

1. demonstrate increased competency in his/her teaching skills;
2. be given an opportunity to become involved in selected areas of the district educational program;